Anti-Slavery Standard Vol. 11-12

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. Without Concealment....Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors.

VOL. XI....NO. 25. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1850. WHOLE NO. 545.

Published Weekly, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, AT 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK,

Terms: TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H Gay, New York

Norris & Brother, Printers.

Pro-Slavery.

LETTER FROM THE HON. SAMUEL A. ELIOT.

We take pleasure in laying before our readers the following communication from the Hon. Samuel A. Eliot, explanatory of his views on the subject of the fugitive slave bill, which received his vote on its passage in the House of Representatives, in concurrence with the Senate, in which body it originated. We trust his constituents and the public will do him the justice of giving it a careful perusal. They will perceive that he has not acted on this subject, as he is incapable of doing on any, thoughtlessly, or without reason satisfactory to his own mind, and such as are deserving of careful consideration. Those who may not agree with him in his conclusions, will at least give him the credit of acting independently, according to his own sense of public duty.—*Daily (Boston) Advertiser.*

Mr. Hale: The peculiar circumstances of the times, and of my own position, induce me to ask of you the use of the columns of the Advertiser for a brief explanation of the reasons of the course I have recently pursued. I do it in the hope, and indeed in entire confidence, that my fellow citizens know me well enough, and have known me long enough, to enable them to believe the statement I am about to make, and that they will impute to me no sinister or ambitious motive for what may not have met with their approbation.

It is rather a striking circumstance attending the excitement of the present moment, that among the several subjects of importance which have been brought to the attention of the great community of the north, the one which has roused all their fire and excited so much sympathy and indignation, is precisely the only one in regard to which there existed any constitutional obligation. All the other questions were to be adjusted on considerations of propriety or expediency; but this upon the sense of duty alone. The feelings are, at all times, very bad guides for political action; and in this case it seemed to me to be imperative upon every one claiming to act on principle, and with due reverence for the constitution, to set aside every impulse of mere feeling, and to consider especially his obligations to the government under which he lives.

In order to have a clear and just sense of the nature and weight of those obligations, I deem it necessary to advert a little to the history of the period when there was no constitution of the United States; to inquire what was the condition of things at that time, what were the reasons for forming the constitution, and the terms upon which alone it could be adopted. It is well known that the state of affairs, both at the north and the south, previous to the adoption of the constitution, was one of unequalled depression and misery. The period of the war of the revolution itself was a less disastrous [illegible] for war gave us the exclusive possession of the home market, at least, and our own industry was supported our own consumption. But with peace came the introduction of foreign commodities, at such rates of duty as each rival State chose to fix—generally the lowest possible, on free-trade principles; and as we had little else than corn, wheat and tobacco to pay with, we were compelled to glut our own markets with a very limited variety of articles, and thus depress our prices for selling, as well as those for buying. People were impoverished, disheartened, miserable, to such a degree that the days of the confederation, between the close of the war and the adoption of the constitution, are universally spoken of by historians, and were always described by the men of that generation whom we remember to have seen, as the darkest and most distressing period of our history. Everybody saw and acknowledged that the Union of these sovereign and independent States into one government was the remedy, and the only remedy for the existing evils. There were great difficulties in the way of such an experiment. It was a complicated arrangement, embracing almost innumerable particulars. But all might be arranged pretty well except one. Slavery had been abolished in some of the States, and still existed in others. Here seemed an insurmountable incompatibility of interests; and nothing perplexed the wise men of that day—and they were *very* wise men—so much as this topic. At last they agreed that the new constitution should have nothing to do with it, that the word Slavery should not be mentioned in it, and that it should be left to the management and control of the States themselves, to establish, retain, or abolish it, just as much after the adoption of the constitution as before. But in order to secure the existence of the institution to those States who prefered it, it was agreed that persons escaping from labor to which they were bound in one commonwealth, and found in another, should be returned to the State from which they had fled. The provision was necessary for the preservation of this interest in *statu quo* It did not *extend* Slavery. It kept it where it already was, and where it could not have continued, if every slave who escaped to the north was at once to be free and irreclaimable. The members of the confederacy from the south saw this distinctly, and deliberately declared that they could not, and would not, enter into a Union with States who would tempt away their slaves with the prospect of immediate and permanent freedom.

The provision of the constitution for restoring fugitive slaves was a conservative measure only. It simply did not curtail the extent of Slavery; or rather it did not abolish it, for such would have been the speedy result, if the United States had guaranteed the freedom of every runaway slave.

The question, then, for our predecessors to decide was, whether it was right and expedient to form a union with slaveholders, and promise them not to interfere with their slaveholding. They decided that it was, as I think we should have done, if we had been in their places. They decided that they could not endure any longer the misery which oppressed them on every side, the subjection to the foreign merchant, the slavery of themselves and their children to the European manufacturer and trader.

The constitution was adopted with this provision; and it could not have been adopted without it. The States that had won their power to make constitutions for themselves, by coöperating through eight long years of exhausting war, and who had thereby acquired a mutual respect and attachment, which could be created by nothing short of such common toils and sacrifices, would never, without that provision, have joined in political union; would never have set the example of the successful experiment of republican government for sixty years of unparalleled growth and prosperity; and would never have left to us the inestimable inheritance of a wisely contrived and balanced government, to which we have been indebted for so many privileges and advantages unknown to the rest of the world, and the prospect of greater and greater success with all advancing time, if we will only maintain it in its original proportions.

Not only did our fathers bequeath us this glorious constitution, but the precious inheritance of their fame, their wisdom, their valor, their patriotism, and especially that spotless reputation of their great leader, "the first in the hearts of his countrymen." I shall not attempt a eulogy on that revered name. It is not necessary. Not a true heart beats in America that does not cherish his renown as a large part of the national glory, or that does not love, as well as honor, the name of Washington. But there have, of late years, sprung up parties who have so far misunderstood, or forgotten, or disregarded the compact of their fathers, as to introduce into the discussions of political subjects, in the government of the United States, the very topic which was excluded from the constitution, and therefore in relation to which the government acting under it can have no power; and who, assuming a responsibility for the continued existence of Slavery, which the framers of the constitution expressly abjured for that government, have felt themselves called upon to discuss the subject in a very excited and violent manner. More than this; they have forgotten (or disregarded) the last injunctions and entreaties of the Father of his country. They have formed a geographical party; and by means of violent language, and sometimes by acts of violence, they have inflamed the slaveholding States in the very manner which was foreseen and forbidden by the wisdom and patriotism of Washington. They repudiate for themselves all interest in the glory of the constitution, and its framers, Washington included, and they throw scorn upon him because he was a slaveholder, and upon his counsels because they urged perpetual union with slaveholders. Such persons *may be* wiser and better men than Washington and his associates, but I am so constituted that I cannot believe it. I do not see in their deeds, or their words, proofs of the same spirit of self-sacrifice for the general good, the same calm firmness, or power to discern the end from the beginning. If there be any thing characteristic of them, it seems to me the very reverse of what distinguished our revolutionary fathers. I observe an intemperance of language which does not usually accompany wisdom, a professed disregard of *all* consequences which is not commonly recognized as the mark either of good judgment, or of good principles. With such parties I cannot act. I believe in the wisdom of the provisions of the constitution. I believe in the propriety of uniting cordially and heartily for certain political ends, not otherwise to be obtained, with those who think themselves justified in holding slaves. I am not willing to renounce my share in the glories of the revolutionary south, any more than of the revolutionary north. I cannot cease to love and honor the fathers of the revolution, or the fathers of the constitution. If the battles of the council chamber or the field were to be fought over again, who would not be as ready to unite with the south, slaveholding as it is, as was John Adams, of Massachusetts, or John Jay, of New York; as ready as Joseph Warren and William Prescott, of Bunker Hill, or Nathaniel Greene, of Eutaw?

I may be allowed to say that I have acted on this principle. In the last session of Congress the struggle for the constitution was renewed; and it has been settled, so far as Congress is concerned, on precisely the same principles as those on which it is was first enacted. I consider the adjustment which has taken place as a re-enactment of the constitution; and may it remain hereafter unassailed.

The attempt has been made, for successive years, to induce the government of the United States to take an active part on the subject of Slavery. This has been resisted, and justly resisted. The government of the United States is bound not to do any such thing. Action on that subject is forbidden to it. It is left exclusively to the people of the several States; and there is precisely where it is left by the recent compromise. We still say to the south, as the constitution says: we will not tempt your slaves to run away from you, by guaranteeing freedom to every one of them who crosses Mason & Dixon's line, or the Ohio river. You may take them back again by the agency of the U. S. officers, since some of the States have prohibited their officers from acting in such cases. We disapprove of the institution—indeed we think it wrong, as well as unwise; but if [illegible] possession of slaves; we have no right to [illegible] your consciences by our own.

This is one part of the meaning of the entire series of measures which constituted the conciliatory policy of the two branches of the national legislature during the last session—a policy adopted under the guidance of prominent men of both the principal parties, and sanctioned by one whose national views, intellectual power, and attachment to the constitution, have placed his fame on the same level with that of the men of the heroic age of our country, as worthy to rank with the most patriotic of revolutionary times. It is the only policy on this subject upon which I can act, or to which I can give my support, directly or indirectly. I believe it to be best for the captive, as well as for the freeman, that the constitution of the United States should be maintained. Whatever may be my sympathy with the slave, and it certainly is not small, I have no right to set him free. I am not responsible in the matter. I did not enslave him, nor do I hold him in Slavery. It is another who does this; and while I differ from that other in opinion as to the justice and expediency of the institution, I have no right to say that he *shall not* hold a slave, if it comports with his judgment of the right and expedient to do so. I may say to him, to by sure, that I will not associate with him, for any purpose, so long as he holds a slave; but I have yet to learn the wisdom, or the peculiar merit, of such a course.

Having thus adverted to the general policy upon which the fugitive slave bill rests, I will state, in a few words, my view of the character of the bill, and its probable effect on the condition of the fugitive. It may seem strange to those who have heard nothing but bitter denunciations of the act, to hear it said that it is, practically, more favorable to the fugitive than the law of 1793. The evidence of such an assertion may be found in the fact that, by the old law, every magistrate in Massachusetts, amounting together to several hundreds, and so in the other States, was authorized and required to cause the arrest of any fugitive, examine into his case, and deliver him to the claimant, if he was proved to be a slave; while under the new law that power is limited to the justices of the United States courts, and to the commissioners appointed by them, not exceeding, perhaps, on an average, six or eight persons in each State. There was no more trial by jury provided for under the old than under the new law. The claim of a jury trial is entirely new, never thought of till modern discussions of the subject began. For fifty-seven years our fathers and we have been living under laws which provided for no such thing; and now one which makes no such provision is denounced in unmeasured terms as cruel and inhuman. Where have we all been for half a century? Do not the denouncers perceive that they are denouncing their fathers and themselves! The entire population of the north has acquiesced in the provisions of the law of 1793, without thinking itself exposed to the charge of barbarity; and I have only to say that I do not think the charge any more just now. Desirable as it may be, that a trial by jury should be required in the State where the arrest is made, the absence of this provision cannot be termed barbarous, or inhuman. Nor should it be overlooked that our southern brethren have sympathies with the colored man. I have heard it stated to have been said by Mr. Clay, in a public manner, and I belive something of the sort occurred in one of his speeches in the Senate, last spring, that he had almost always succeeded when he had acted as counsel for the captive, but never when he had been engaged by the master; and that there was a general leaning in favor of the claim of freedom. And why should we doubt it? Do we imagine the entire south to be inhabited by fiends? Have we forgotten that the white man of the south is of common origin with us, and has probably some of the same feelings of humanity with ourselves? Let us not dream that all virtue and all wisdom will die with us.

It is said the new law suspends the operation of the writ of habeas corpus. Legal authority of the highest kind declares this to be untrue; and we all know, without being jurists, that no law can supersede the constitution.

It is said, too, that the new law is unreasonable, because it throws the responsibility of safe custody upon the marshal, at all events. This may be a hardship upon the marshal, but does not effect the position of the fugitive particularly; and it resembles so nearly the liability of every sheriff for the custody of every prisoner, that no such broad distinction exists as is sometimes asserted.

Again, the law makes it penal to assist in the rescue of the slave, after he has been proved to be such. Of course it must, and the penalty must be effective, or there would be the inconsistency of an enactment which might be violated with impunity. The penalty should certainly be graduated by the nature of the offence, and I am disposed to believe that, in this particular, the law needs amendment. But it is manifest that the violent charges brought against the law are, in reality, brought against the principle of the provision of the constitution requiring the delivery of the fugitive from labor. The reasons for originally making that provision have been already stated; and it appears to me that they are as strong for continuing it in force, as they were for making it first. The Union cannot be preserved without it, any more than it could have been formed without it. The abolition of Slavery is not retarded by it. It is the discussion of the subject in non-slaveholding States which delays emancipation. This it is which alarms the slaveholder, as well as it may. This it is which leads him to rivet the chain more firmly, and look to the links more carefully; and when we shall have ceased irritating him by rancorous language, he may then, but certainly not till then, begin to calculate coolly the advantages and disadvantages of the institution, and to perceive, without prejudice, the right and the wrong of the practice. Denunciation and violence are not likely to remedy any of the wrongs for which we complain of the South; and it is especially to be deprecated by those who have an interest in the welfare of the colored man, an interest which I feel as deeply as any of my friends and constituents. It must be recollected that emancipation, if it is to come at all, must originate with those masters who are so often assailed with opprobrious language; and that the best influence the north can exert on the subject, in behalf of the slave, is moral influence.

The sentiments and wishes of Massachusetts, as expressed by her legislature, and felt by her people, are in the highest degree honorable to her philanthropy, and with few exceptions, are consistent with the obligations she is under to the Union. But they can impose no duty which can absolve her citizens from the observance of the "higher law" of the constitution; and unless she means to adopt and practice the principles of nullification, she must consent to the delivery of the fugitive from labor. In short, the whole matter resolves itself into the plain question, shall the compromises of the constitution be observed, or shall they be violated, and with the violation shall the bond of union be broken? To me the proper course in answer to this question, seems plain. The law which binds me to the fulfilment of the promises of the constitution, as of all other promises, is a part of the highest law which I recognize, and I shall not deliberately violate it. I shall hold on to the Union, even with slaveholding States, with a tenacity which nothing but the sternest necessity will unloose, as the only political hope of the world.

I know there are those who say and think that there is no danger to the Union; that we may talk, and write, and petition, and refuse to perform what have been esteemed our constitutional obligations on the subject of Slavery as much as we please, and that nobody will do anything but bluster in return; but as I think differently, I must shape my course differently. It is my opinion that this very language is insulting, and therefore improper and dangerous. Those whose use it cannot advert to its irritating character, nor to the indisputable fact that a state of violent and long continued excitement is inevitably a state of danger to any community. It is now the duty of good citizens, as I conceive, certainly it is my own duty, to do everything that is practicable to calm the irritation that exists between the north and the south, and to reunite them in good will and the spirit of mutual aid, and to have enjoyed [illegible] the inestimable blessings we [illegible] the unmixed and immeasureable evil that must flow from division.

It will not be inferred, I trust, from anything I have now said, that I consider the law which has been passed unexceptionable. There are amendments which I strongly desire to see introduced into it, and for which I would have labored when it was passed in the house of representatives, had it been possible. But every one knows that was impracticable, and the question was whether this bill or none should be passed. I deem conformity to the design of the constitution more important than the objectionable details of the bill, and while I claim no authority for my own judgment, I trust I may be permitted to say that I have acted as I thought for the best. Perhaps I may also claim, without arrogance, to have exhibited heretofore, by substantial services, a genuine sympathy with the wronged and oppressed, and may hope that I shall not be considered as having altogether lost the disposition to aid them, because I cannot show it by setting aside constitutional obligations, or pursuing a course which would lead to disunion and anarchy, and would be destructive to all alike, the slave and the free, the African and the European races.

Respectfully, &c.,

SAMUEL A. ELLIOT.

IMPORTANT LETTER ON THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW FROM JUDGE GRIER.

The following letter from Judge Grier, of the United States Supreme Court, upon the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law, will be read with interest:—

Philadelphia, October 25, 1850.

Dear Sir—My official engagements have hindered me from giving that prompt attention to the contents of your letter of the 22d instant which it would otherwise have received.

Until informed by you, I was unable to apprehend what possible cause could be assigned for the unmeasured denunciations with which the act concerning fugitives from labor passed at the last session of Congress, has been received by so many persons in the northern portion of our Union. Although it would be improper for me to volunteer extra judicial opinions upon doubtful questions of construction of a public statute, yet, if any opinions expressed by the court on the late case of Henry Garnett, or which, though not then expressed, seem to me incapable of dispute, can have any tendency to correct misapprehensions and calm the public agitation on this subject, I am perfectly willing to state them.

In the Garnett case, the warrant issued by the court was founded on the affidavit of the alleged owner of the fugitive. But 'on the trial or hearing,' before the court, after the arrest, this affidavit was not received in evidence, nor did the counsel for the claimant insist that it should be received. The claimant had wholly neglected to make the proper proof, before some court or judge in Maryland, to establish the fact, that he was owner of a slave, or person held to labor, and what was the name, age, size, and other marks of such person, and that the person so described had escaped. Not having availed himself of the privileges and facilities given him by the act of Congress for this purpose, we decided that he must be bound by the common law rules of evidence, as in other cases, where a title to property has to be established before a court. We refused to receive the parties in interest as witnesses, and wills, and other documents of title, unless properly proved.

The act contemplates a trial and a decison of the court or judge involving qnestions of law and fact, and unless the rules of the common law as to evidence be followed, when not changed by statute, the tribunal would be without rule, governed only by caprice, or undefined descretion, which would be the exercise of a tyrannical not a judicial power. It is the duty of the judge who exercises it, to render equal justice both to the claimant and the person claimed. If evidence were heard on one side only, and that, too, without any regard to any rule or principle known to the law, gross oppression and wrong would flow from it. Freemen and citizens of Pennsylvania might be kidnapped into bondage, under the forms of law, and by the action of a legal tribunal, sworn to do equal and exact justice to all men. This much maligned law not only gives a 'trial' before the legal tribunal, before the claimant can be authorized to carry the alleged fugitive out of the State, but it takes away from the prisoner no right which he would have enjoyed before this act of Congress was passed.

In all cases of extradition, the evidence of establishing the offence and escape of the person demanded, is usually made in the country from which the person demanded has escaped, and it is necessarily *ex-parte*, and the chief question to be decided by the tribunal before whom he is brought, previously to make an order for his extradition, is only the question of identity. The party demanded has a right, of course, to show that he is not the person described. But if he be the person described, he has no right to claim a jury trial, as to the question of his guilt, in the country to which he has escaped. The question of identity, and whether the person claimed is such a one as the treaty between the two countries requires to be delivered up, has always been tried summarily and without the intervention of a jury. No complaint has ever been made when white men have been sent to Europe, on a demand for their extradition without giving them a jury trial: and why greater privileges in this matter should be granted to colored persons, is not easily perceived.—The State of Pennsylvania guarantees a jury trial to her own citizens, or to persons who are charged with comitting an offence within her borders. Fugitives from another State have no such rights. The government to which the fugitive belongs, it is to be presumed, will do justice to its own subjects or citizens, and whether they do so or not, is no concern of ours. However individuals may fancy they have a mission to rectify all wrongs on the face of the earth, the State of Pennsylvania does not feel herself bound to the Quixotic enterprise of avenging the oppression of serfs in Russia, or slaves in Georgia. This act of Congress does not require that a judge should, without a trial surrender a citizen of Pennsylvania to a kidnapper. The provision, 'that in no trial or hearing, under this act, shall the testimony of such fugitive be admitted in evidence,' is no more than the enactment of an established principle of the common law, that no man shall be witness in his own cause. If this provision were not in the act, I would not receive the testimony of the prisoner to prove that he was the person described, or that he was a free man. It would be a temptation to perjury which no tribunal should permit to be presented to any man. No lawyer would urge before a court such an absurd construction of the act of Congress, as that it means that no evidence shall be heard on the part of the alleged fugitive. If such were the intention of the legislature, it was easy to express it in unequivocal terms. In truth, there is nothing equivocal in the language of the act; it forbids the judge to hear the testimony of the fugitive, but not the testimony of disinterested witnesses. It almost seems that nothing but a desire to render the law odious, for the sake of political agitation, could ever have led to so gross a misconstruction, and so gross a libel on our national legislature. It has been objected, also, to this law, that it suspends the *habeas corpus* act, inasmuch as it enacts that the certificate of the judge, or commissioner, 'shall be conclusive of the right of the persons, in whose favor granted to remove such fugitive, and shall prevent all molestation of such person or persons, by any process issued by any court, judge, magistrate or other person whomsoever.' But this is a mistake. The truth is, that this provision of the law forbidding the testimony of the fugitive to be received, and forbidding interference by other process, after a certificate, is but an enactment of an established principle of the common law, added through extreme caution, but wholly unnecessary. 'The writ of *habeas corpus* is undoubtedly an immediate remedy for every illegal imprisonment; but no imprisonment is illegal when the process is a justification of the officer; and process, whether by writ or warrant, is legal, whenever it is not defective in the frame of it, and has issued in the ordinary course of justice, from a court or magistrate having jurisdiction of the subject matter.'—(Commonwealth vs. Lecky, 1 Watts, 87). [illegible] of a judge or magistrate, [illegible] imprisoned, under process 'from a court or magistrate having jurisdiction,' and cannot be released by any other court or magistrate, on a writ of *habeas corpus* or *homine replegiando*. The act of 1793 has no such provisions as that which is the subject of complaint in the present case; yet in the case of Wright vs. Deacon, (5 Sergt. and Rawle, 62,) the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania decided that a certificate under that act was a legal warrant to remove the fugitive to the State of Maryland, and no writ of *homine replegiando* would lie from a State Court to try the question of freedom; and that a writ issued under such circumstonces was in 'violation of the constitution of the United States.'

The chief difference between the fugitive act of 1850 and that of 1793 is, that the former allows a warrant to be issued by a judge, and the arrest to be made by a public officer, and imposes more stringent penalties on those who interfere, by violence, to prevent the execution of legal process. Those who believe that the constitution and laws of their country should be regarded and obeyed, have no ground of complaint; and those who do not, will continue to rail at both, as usual.

I am happy to say that my brother Kane fully concurs with me in the views I here express.

I am, very respectfully, yours, &c., &c.,

R. C. GRIER.

To Charles Gibbons, Esq.

Selections.

MR. MANN'S ANSWER.

TO THE FREE SOIL NOMINATION IN THE EIGHTH DISTRICT.

Quincy, 21st October, 1850.

Hon. Horace Mann, West Newton, Mass.: *Dear Sir*,—At the Convention held on the 16th instant, by the members of the Free Soil party in the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts, for the purpose of nominating a candidate to represent that District in the thirty-second Congress, I was charged with the agreeable duty of apprising you, that you were unanimously chosen to be the person.

In transmitting to you herewith the record of the proceedings and of the authority under which I act, permit me to assure you of the great sympathy with which we witness the trials to which you and others have been exposed in the performance of what you hold to be your duty, and of our great confidence in the firmness with which you will continue in the great struggle of the time, to uphold the noble cause to which at the outset, you promised to devote yourself. I am, dear sir, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,
Charles Francis Adams.

West Newton, Oct. 24th, 1850.

Hon. C. F. Adams: *Dear Sir*,—Your favor of the 21st instant, is this day received. It informs me that at a Convention, (over which you had the honor to preside,) held at Dedham on the 16th inst., I was unanimously nominated as a candidate for Representative to the 32d Congress of the United States. For the kind terms in which your communication is expressed, be pleased to accept my thanks.

This nomination places me in no new relation to the friends of Freedom and Humanity, wherever they may be found. I believe my name was first suggested to the voters of this District, (now nearly three years ago,) on the ground of my supposed devotion to the Rights of Man. The resolutions passed at all the conventions by which I have been nominated, and especially those passed so repeatedly and unanimously by our State Legislature, have been in the nature of instructions; or, at least, of urgent advice and solicitation, in regard to my course on the great questions which have since agitated the country. My own convictions of duty, so fully and entirely corresponding with the injunctions thus laid upon me, it has been easy for me to act in full conformity to the wishes of the great majority of my constituents and of the State, as those wishes have been repeatedly expressed. This renders any detailed exposition of expectations on your part, or of assurances on mine unnecessary. I know that the leading and most valued article in your creed is the sacredness and security of Human Freedom. You know, that I embrace this same article of faith with my whole heart. Other matters may be very important, but still are subordinate. Peculiar forms of organization are comparatively non-essentials. They are but means to ends; and, in regard to them, a large allowance is to be made for honest differences of opinion. But the natural right of every human being to the liberty which God has given him, until forfeited by crime of his own; the duty of our government to save every part of this earth over which it has jurisdiction from the direst of all earthly curses and the greatest of all social crimes—the curse and the crime of Slavery;—these are among the first of the dread accountabilities that attach to rational and immortal creatures.

I believe it also to be the duty of the government to provide for the economical or pecuniary welfare of the people; to encourage industry by securing the rewards of labor to the laborer, and to discourage the competitions into which those who rule and control the impoverished, degraded and almost brutified laborers of other countries are striving to enter with our own people,—competitions which, if not prevented, will, to a great extent, reduce our laborers to the wretchedness and privation of theirs. I believe that the money, and the comforts purchasable with it, which such competitions take from the workmen here, do not go to improve the condition of the workmen there, but are intercepted and appropriated by others. I make this statement of my views all the more readily, because I do not wish to receive an unintelligent vote from any man, and I therefore abjure all disguises and reserves. From my past votes and speeches in Congress, my constituents know upon what principles and to what ends I have acted. To them I refer, and deem it unnecessary to say more.

Those who have taken the trouble to read what I have said on the floor of the House, must have seen that, though I have endeavored to express some stern truths, on vital subjects, in unambiguous language, yet that I have never uttered a word designed to inflict unnecessary pain upon our political brethren of the South, or to wound feelings which men may erroneously call honorable. I desire to pursue the same course at all times and with all men. The cause of liberty is one in which the true object of ambition is to make great principles most clear, and not to use harsh expressions respecting the conduct or opinion of others. It is unnecessary that the man whom I would convince should be in a calm state of mind, as that I should be in such a state myself. Exasperation paralyzes judgment. The great points on which men and parties so vehemently differ, can only be permanently settled at the tribunal of reason.

Several laws were passed at the last session of Congress, on which I desired and designed to speak, in the name and on behalf of my constituents. But I was obliged to act upon them under the silence enforced by the Previous Question. One of them, in particular, was so hostile to all the principles which history and reason had ever taught me, and so wounding to all the sentiments which I had ever imbibed from benevolence and religion, that I resolved to seize the first opportunity that should be offered to portray some of its features. I refer to the Fugitive Slave Bill, so called; and I trust this will not be deemed an unfitting occasion to lay bare a part of its enormities. I will remark, that I had prepared an amendment for the security of our free colored seamen in Southern ports, but was shut out from all chance of offering it. It struck me that if new and oppressive measures were to be taken to carry back alleged slaves to bondage, something should also be done to restore freemen to liberty. While the South were seeking new guaranties for men who claim to own other men, it was a time for the North to demand new guaranties for men who own themselves. But all debate was suppressed: property vanquished liberty; and a pure [illegible]

In regard to this Fugitive Slave Bill, is it not astonishing that men should ever ask the question: Does the Constitution *demand* the trial by jury, instead of the question: Will the Constitution *allow* it? The first is the tyrant's question, granting no more than he is compelled to give. The last is the republican's question, volunteering all that he can grant. In a free government, where the trial by jury is held to be the surest safeguard of personal liberty, the inquiry ought never to be, whether the Constitution *secures or necessitates* this form of trial; for it is enough, if the Constitution will *permit or tolerate* it. Instead of seeking evasions, and close constructions, and hunting among the musty precedent of darker times, in order to shut out the jury trial in cases of personal liberty, the true lover of freedom would ask only for an interpretation that would *warrant* it. It would not be among his last thought; he would not wait until a stern necessity forced such a construction upon him; but his first desire and effort would be to find some legitimate reason for conferring it. He would not ask, in how few cases he must, but in how many he might, admit it. Yet this matter has been discussed, and is still discussed, on one side, as though we were bound to avoid the jury trial if we could; not as though we were bound to grant it, if by fair interpretation we might. It has been discussed as though the jury trial, to protect a man's right to himself, were an evil; and as though the sudden seizure, "summary" adjudication, and speedy consignment of a fellow-being to bondage, were too precious a blessing to be put in jeopardy, by submission to twelve good and lawful men. Not how much may we do for Freedom, but how much can we do for Slavery, has been the tact assumption of the argument. But I pass by this for graver objections.

The fugitive slave bill purports to confer judicial power upon persons who are not judges. It provides for the creation of scores and hundreds of officers called "commissioners," and upon these it is said on high authority, to confer *original* and *final* jurisdiction on questions of human liberty. The Constitution declares in whom "the judicial power of the United States shall be vested." It shall be vested "in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time establish." No commissioner nor any number of commissioners constitutes one of these courts. "The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior." A commissioner can be made and unmade, on any day. These judges are to "receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office." The commissioners are compensated by chance fees, and not by a fixed salary. The President nominates and the Senate confirms judges of the supreme and inferior courts. Commissioners are only the "inferior officers" who may be appointed by "the courts of law."

I need not enforce the position, that the power which this Bill purports to confer upon commissioners is *judicial*. It has all the attributes of judicial power. It is original, final and exclusive. They are "to hear and determine." The fourth section says that they "shall have *concurrent* jurisdiction with the judges of the circuit and district courts of the United States." The Attorney General of the United States, in a written opinion, given by command of the President of the United States, says as follows:—"These officers and each of them [the commissioners] have *judicial* power, and jurisdiction to hear, examine and decide the case." "The certificate to be granted to the owner is to be regarded as the act and judgment of a judicial tribunal having competent jurisdiction"—"Congress has constituted a tribunal with exclusive jurisdiction to determine summarily, and without appeal, who are fugitives from service." "The judgment of the tribunal created by this act is conclusive upon all tribunals." The power of a commissioner, therefore, is judicial in the highest sense,—in the sense of the constitution. His decision cannot be re-heard or re-examined by any judge, or by any court, of any State, or of the United States. "In no other case can a commissioner perform any judicial act, or issue any executive order, whose validity may not be re-examined in the court for which he acts, or in some other. He cannot strike a blow, nor fine a dollar, nor punish by imprisonment for an hour. By appeal, by injunction, by mandamus or certiorari, the proceedings of inferior courts or magistrates can be reached, and their legality or constitutionality tested. But here a multitude of tribunals are established over whose proceedings, not the Supreme Court of any State; no, not even the Supreme Court of the United States, has supervision. And what do these commissioners decide? That a man has no right to himself; that his body, limbs, faculties, are the *property* of another; that he *owes service.*—Suppose the question were whether the respondent owed the claimant a dollar. Could the commissioner give judgment and issue execution for it? Certainly not. But yet he is here authorized to decide questions infinitely more important than any amount of money. He is to decide that a man owes life-long service from himself, and from all the children of his loins.

But the surrender of an alleged fugitive from service has been compared with the surrender of a fugitive from justice; and because the Supreme Executive of a State is required by the law of 1793 to surrender fugitives from justice, it is claimed that any commissioner may surrender fugitives from service, *without liability to question or re-examination by any human authority.* But there is a world-wide difference between the cases. When the fugitive from justice is delivered up, he is delivered into the custody of the law. Legal process must have been commenced against him in the State from which he fled. He is returned that the proceedings thus commenced may be consummated. He is never entrusted to private hands. The shield of the law is continued over him. After arrest, he is merely transferred from the hands of the law in one State, to the hands of the law in another State. He is transferred, not to evade trial, but to have one. But the alleged slave is delivered up, not into the custody of the law, where his rights might be adjudicated upon, but into private hands; not into the hands of a neutral or indifferent person, but into the hands of a party interested to deprive him of all his rights;—if he be not a slave, then into the hands of a man-stealer. Mr. Clay saw this, and his plan provided that the alleged fugitive should be sent home *to be tried.* But the South grew bolder and bolder, until a law was passed, by which one class of men have less security for their freedom than another class have for their cattle.

It is nugatory to say, that when an alleged fugitive has reached his claimant's domicile, he may there petition for freedom. Should he do so, it would be an independent and original proceeding, instituted under *another* government. Not only would the jurisdiction be different, but the character of the litigants would be changed,—plaintiff for defendant, and defendant for plaintiff. The old case is not reheard, but a new one tried. Indeed, a very intelligent writer on this subject has queried whether the certificate of the Commissioner may not be pleaded as an estoppel. I say then that, in effect, the Commissioner, by this act, has *original final and exclusive* jurisdiction of a "case" "in law," "arising under the constitution and laws of the United States." This is the very junction of judges and courts. This is the identical power which the constitution of the United States vests in judges who are to be nominated by the President, confirmed by the Senate, to hold office during good behavior, and to be compensated by fixed salaries.

Again, the bill consigns a man to bondage, without crime, on evidence which he has had no opportunity to controvert. The claimant must prove three facts before the commissioner,—1st, That the person named in the warrant owes the claimant service; 2d. That he has escaped; 3d, identity.

Now, according to the bill, the first two points;—the facts of owing service and of escaping,—may be proved behind the respondent's back. This proof may be procured against the alleged fugitive without any notice to him, actual or constructive; without the possibility of his encountering it, or disproving it, however false it may be. If this is [illegible] whole case proveable behind the man's back,—in another State,—a thousand miles off,—and spurn the forms of justice after having spurned its substance? This binding of a man by evidence obtained without his knowledge, is unknown to the common law, and abhorent to it. It is never permitted, not even to deprive the worst man of his humblest right. Our laws save the rights of all parties under disability. Who is under so great a disability as he who knows nothing, and can know nothing, of what is going on against him? Notwithstanding, the constitution declares that "full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of every other State," yet it has been held that a judgment obtained in another State, without notice, shall not prejudice the party against whom it was rendered. Such an act violates the first principles of justice.—All securities for the life, liberty and property of us all, are swept away if such principles can be established.

Once more: The bill says the certificate "shall be conclusive of the right of the person or persons in whose favor granted, to remove such fugitive to the State or territory from which he escaped, and shall prevent all molestation of such person or persons, by any process issued by any court, judge, magistrate, or any other person whomsoever." According to this, the certificate is a talisman which protects its holder against all law, all evidence, and all judicial power. A kidnapper may seize a free man in Boston, buy evidence that he ows this mysterious *debt of service*, obtain the requisite certificate against his victim, and then neither the mother who bore him, nor the elder brothers and sisters who grew up with him, nor the neighbors who have known him from his cradle, nor the minister who baptized him, can testify that he is free; nor can all the judges and courts in the Commonwealth stop the man who is bearing away one of their fellow-citizens to a bondage worse than death, to inquire into his title. He is in a charmed circle that neither law nor justice can enter. Do you ask where is that old, time-honored writ of Habeas Corpus, for which martyrs have died and rivers of blood have flowed, and which the Constitution declares SHALL NOT be suspended "unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it!" The answer is, that the writ of Habeas Corpus is nothing but a "process issued" by a court, and the bill declares that the holder of the certificate shall be exempt from all "molestation," "by any process issued by any court."

In one word, the law contains a provision that its own constitutionality shall not be brought into question; at least, until its victim reaches the place of his bondage, and is beyond the reach of rescuing hands.

Now, even if this bill does not commit such gross infractions of the Constitutions that the courts will set it aside; yet it would seem as though no sane man could help seeing that it wars upon all our ideas of justice; that it repudiates and scorns all the great securities for freedom which wise and good men, for centuries past, have given their labors, and their lives, to establish; and that it converts the vast machinery of the social state, not into the means of protecting, but of assailing the liberties of the citizen. As to the appointment of Commissioners, it gives us none of the constitutional securities that improper men will not be invested with these high prerogatives against our dearest rights; and as to the manner in which evidence may be procured, it resembles the missives which the Inquisition, in olden times, sent forth against heretics, to seize without law, to try without defence, and to punish without mercy or hope. It resembles the *Lettres de cachet*, which, before the great revolution, the despots of France gave, in *blank*, to villain courtiers, and villain courtesans, to be filled up with the names of those persons whose perdition they would compass.

There are other points in this bill whose enormity only needs to be stated to be seen and abhorred.—One of them is so unspeakably mean and contemptible, that all Northern men must feel the insult more keenly than the wrong. It provides that if a Commissioner will doom a man to bondage, his fee shall be twice as much as though he restores him to liberty. Now every body knows that claimants will rarely, if ever, appear before commissioners without a *prima facie* case. If there be no defence, the proceedings will be brief. But a case of discharge presupposes a defence and a trial. A case of discharge therefore, will probably occupy as much time as

half a dozen cases of surrender. Yet for this greater labor, the commissioner is to have but half price.—In assailing all we love of liberty could not the framers and supporters of this measure have forborne to wound us in all we feel of honor!

The cases are to be "heard and determined," as they were under Robespierre, "*in a summary manner.*" Shakspeare enumerates the "law's delay" among the causes of suicide. Under this bill, real suicides will doubtless be occasioned by the *laws despatch*.* This "summary manner" contains the sum of wrong. Does not every lawyer and every client know that when an action is brought for the unfaithful execution of a contract, in building a house or a ship, or for the balance of an account or for flowing lands or for defamation or libel, the defendant needs weeks and often months, to make ready for his defence. His witness may be in another State or abroad; it may be necessary to examine ancient titles in registries of deeds or of wills, to make surveys of premises, or investigations into character and conduct. It often happens that when process is first served upon a man, he does not know the grounds of his own defence. They may consist of facts which he has forgotten, or of law of which he is ignorant. Our courts, acting upon this well-known truth, have established a rule that a party, even after he has had fourteen days' notice, shall be entitled to a continuance as a matter of right, unless under special circumstances; and he may always have it on cause shown. I ask any defendant who was ever forced into court to resist a claim of any magnitude or difficulty, whether he was ready to do so on the instant when process was served upon him. Yet this is what the respondent must not do under the Fugitive Slave Bill. On the 20th day of last September, James Hamlet was peacefully pursuing a lawful occupation in Water street New York, and earning an honest support for his wife and children. In three hours, handcuffed, in irons, and surrounded by armed men, he was on his way to the House of Bondage. No time was given him for procuring the aid of counsel. He declared he was free, that his mother was a free woman, and he was a free man. But by another provision in the bill, it is declared that "in no trial or hearing under this act, shall the testimony of such alleged fugitive be admitted in evidence." In all other cases, within the broad compass of the common or statute law of Great Britian or of this country, a party litigant may give evidence pertaining to the suit. In some cases, he may give evidence on the merits; in all cases, he may make affidavit on interlocutory matters. A man who has been in the State prison, a felon scarred with crime may still make affidavit, in his own case, under certain circumstances, though he can testify neither for nor against any other person. But an alledged fugitive can make oath to no fact, and under no circumstances, for delay or other cause. It would conflict with that "summary manner" in which it is deemed expedient to dispose of human liberty.

Look at this provision under the light of a few facts In the case of Mahoney v. Ashton, (4 Harris & McHenry's Maryland Reports,) the petitioner for freedom claimed that a maternal ancestor, *four generations back*, who had been brought over by Lord Baltimore, in the early days of the colony, was free and, by an extraordinary chain of evidence, he traced his decent from that free source. It was a claim which any court in Massachusetts would have sustained, without hesitation.

Now how much of evidence, of history, of record, of parol, does the bare mention of such a case suggest? Who could have been prepared to try it in three hours; aye, as soon as he could be seized and hurried to a lawyer's office?

Among the alleged fugitives in the "Pearl cases" so called, which I assisted in trying in Washington, in the years 1848 and '49, was the family of Daniel Bell, consisting of his wife and (I think) seven children. The mother and children had been freed many years before by deed of manumission, executed by their master in his last sickness, and they had been reputed free ever afterwards. Soon after the grantor's death the device was started of proving him to be of "unsound mind," and thus reclaiming the family to bondage. But the magistrate who prepared the deed, witnessed its execution, and took the acknowledgment, declared that he stood ready to testify to the *competency* of the grantor, and the validity of the instrument Years passed away and *he* died Immediately, the heirs claimed the family as slaves: and after the loss of the deceased magistrate's testimony, proved the grantor of "unsound mind" and so set aside the deed, and were adjudged owners of the *chattels*. On the ground of newly-discovered evidence, application for a new trial was made; but the family becoming alarmed lest they should be secretly seized and [illegible] April. Now suppose they had succeeded, and that, after arriving in a free State, they had been seized and carried before a commissioner, to be tried in this "summary manner" without even waiting for a crier to open the court, and debarred from making affidavit that, in the city of Washington, there existed evidence of their freedom. I will not waste words to point out the impossibility of their defence, and the certainty of their doom! He that hath ears to hear the cry of the oppressed, let him hear!

A few days before the close of the last session of Congress, I was inquired of by a resident of Washington, as to the condition of a family held as slaves in that city. I found they were free by the laws of the District, but they did not know it.

Sir, throughout the Southern States, there are thousands and thousands of reputed slaves, who, legally, and by the laws of those States, too, in which they are held, are as free as the Governor of Massachusetts, or the Chief Justice; but, in their enforced, and brutish ignorance, the victims do not know it; and should they come to a free State, and be there hunted, and seized, and carried before a Commissioner, they would be debarred from taking an oath as to facts which would furnish grounds for a continuance, so that their right to freedom might be established. But, under such obstructions and embarrassments, liberty could not be extinguished in a sufficiently "summary manner."

According to the Constitution of the United States, all *criminals*, from the least to the greatest, are to be informed of the nature and cause of their accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against them; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in their favor; and have the assistance of counsel in their defence. Yet here, always in the case of an *innocent* man, oftentimes in the case of a free man, there is to be no previous notice, no process for obtaining witnesses, no provisions for counsel; and while the court is forbidden to allow delay, without good cause shown, the party whose liberty is at stake cannot make out that cause by his oath; but with the full knowledge in his own breast that *is* free, he must stand dumb before the minister of the law that puts on his fetters.

I will not dwell at any length upon these portions of the bill which affect marshals and deputy marshals. If any man chooses not to hold office under such a law, he can decline to accept it, or resign it. It is, however, clear proof of wicked legislation, when humane and conscientious men cannot hold the office it creates But the fifth section contains a provision which is atrocious. It makes the marshal or his deputy liable for an escape, whether made "with or *without* his assent,"—that is, *at all veents*. Though the alleged fugitive should disable him, though the enemies of the country should capture him though the act of God should strike him down, though an armed mob should commit a rescue.—yet he is still liable.

All civilized governments have statutes of limitations. Human welfare requires that claims which have been long voluntarily acquiesced in should not be revived Hence our laws bar a right of action, otherwise incontrovertible, after the tacit abandonment of which the mere lapse of time is proof.—Personal rights are most generally abandoned by a six year's neglect to enforce them. Even real estate may be held, by twenty year's quiet possession, without other title. Crimes partake of this exemption. With the single exception of murder, all crimes are barred in Massachusetts by a six year's delay to prosecute. But the Fugitive Slave Bill knows no mercy or compassion of this kind. Unrelentingly it fastens its clutch upon all cases—While life lasts, its fangs strike into the flesh. The alleged slave may have been amongst us for fifty years; he may have earned property, be married, and surrounded by children. It is all the same. The inexorable certificate of a Commissioner remands him to bondage and despair.

The Bill not only remands him to bondage, but, under circumstances to which there will be few exceptions, it orders that he be sent home at the public expense. The Constitution says, he shall be "delivered up." There the obligation of that instrument ceases. It is only the law that adds, he shall be *carried back*. You and I, sir, must help pay the cost of sending a fellow-being into bondage; when we are under no more constitutional obligations to do so, than to pay the expenses of a slave dealer who ships his cargoes direct from Africa.

But the Bill has become a law, and the practical question now is, how can the country be exculpated from the crime and the dishonor. For myself, I do not adopt the doctrine of forcible nullification. I trust I shall never join a mob to resist a law, until I am ready for revolution. The only true and enduring remedy is Repeal. Those who would forcibly resist the law, lose half their motive and impulse for repeal; for if we abolish it without repealing it, it would be likely to remain on the statute-book, an eternal monument of the nation's disgrace Let efforts never cease, until the jury trial be obtained.

But this view of civil duty applies only to the *citizen*. It does not touch the fugitive. One liberty the slave always has—whenever he deems it expedient, he may re-clothe himself in the rights which God and nature gave him, and which, though they may be ravished from him, can never be destroyed.

Until repeal, however, there is one opening for hope. If, as is said by Mr. Crittenden, in the opinion already cited, "Congress has constituted a tribunal with *exclusive* jurisdiction, to determine summarily, and without appeal," and if, as he further says, "the judgment of every tribunal of exclusive jurisdiction, where no appeal lies, is of necessity *conclusive upon every other tribunal*, AND THEREFORE THE JUDGMENT OF THE TRIBUNAL CREATED BY THIS ACT IS CONCLUSIVE UPON ALL TRIBUNALS:" then, the whole case, in all its bearings and relations, its sources and issues, comes before the Commissioner; not even the Supreme Court of the United States can interfere with him; and the first question for him to "hear and determine" is, whether in truth there be any such *law*, whether the whole disgraceful enactment be not unconstitutional and void; and therefore whether his first and only duty be not to dismiss the proceedings, and to "let the captive go free." I am not without hope that such will be the result; and thus, that many conscientious and law-abiding men will be relieved from the anxiety and the mental conflict which now oppress their minds.

Very truly, your obedient servant,

HORACE MANN.

*Since writing the above, I see that a man in New Jersey was so overcome with fright at the rumor that slave-catchers were in town, that paralysis and death speedily ensued.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment....Without Compromise.

NEW YORK: THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1850.

PSEUDO-CONSERVATISM.

If this country may claim any advantage over Europe, it is surely not in externals, but in its political ideas and the greater freedom for their developement. It is the world of Experiment. The elements of our social condition have not so hardened us that new combinations are impossible without disruption. The great currents of routine and tradition set not so strongly through settled channels that the Ship of State cannot be kept off the lee shore without coming to an anchor, to remain stationary while the cables hold, or till some stronger gale drive it among the breakers. Our growth is not merely that of the polypus, but every new organization which springs out of us and gradually detaches itself from us, contains in itself original elements, based either upon experience, or upon theory, to be tried and rejected, or added to the definite formulæ of political science. Freedom of autocthonic development is our peculiar privilege and safeguard, and the touch of Europe brings only disease and vice to us as to the islanders of the South Sea.

But there is among us a class who seem always to forget that the important word *America* must form one term of all our political equations. They read European histories, reviews, and newspapers, and apply to our affairs whatever principles they succeed in extracting from them. It is not seldom the case that Greece and Rome, even, furnish their wisest saws and most modern instances. The courses and periods of commonwealths are not to be predicted with that mathematical certainty which will give us within a hair's breadth the place of a planet at any given time. Human nature, it is true, must always be the basis of our calculations, but [illegible] it may act or suffer, and make full allowance for disturbing or accelerating forces. Nvertheless, these well-meaning persons would introduce by force into our Body Politic a certain antiseptic ingredient which they call Conservatism, much in the same way that timber is injected with chemical substances to keep it from rotting. They forget that it is only dead wood which is treated in this way, and that Nature has provided in the sap and its unhindered circulation the surest preservative for the living tree.

Nothing that is alive and healthy needs any assistance toward its own conservation. All such precautionary measures are at best but mummy-making, and prolong decay without preventing it. The Chinese offer the readiest example of a nation embalmed alive, and the result does not encourage imitation. Commonwealths need a decent apparel of constitutions and laws, but do not need to be clothed in straight-jackets. Our surest safeguard in America is that we are the busiest people in the world, and that every drop of our blood is in rapid circulation.

We said *every* drop but there is one spot of stagnation, and it is to the maintenance of this just as it is that the efforts of our self-styled conservatives are directed. If our timid friends would only confine themselves to raising money for the erection of pillars to keep the sky from falling, or to calling public meetings to preserve the procession of the Equinoxes, we should never meddle with them. But they not only claim for themselves this holy name of Preservers, they stigmatize all who will not join them as Destructives. We wish to have the titles applied so that they shall no longer be nicknames, but designations.

The true Conservative is he who strives to form some just augury of the Inevitable, and to make ready for its coming; who does all in his power to give affairs such a direction that the Future may enter as a Fulfiller, and not as an Avenger. In history he seeks a lesson, and not the old clothes to dress a scarecrow in. But we are a people of yesterday, without a past, without traditions, who feel no reverence for laws which are the work of our own hands, and must be *taught* it? Often said, but none the truer though a wilderness of parrots repeat it. People respect laws passed by themselves because they are commonly the result of a need previously felt. The statute books are guages marking the popular level of intelligence at successive periods. Laws become a dead letter precisely in proportion as they become unrepresentative and fail to embody the latest wisdom of the people. It is as impossible to reënact a foregone state of opinion as to bring General Taylor back to life by a resolve of Congress. Moreover, Truth is not of yesterday, is not without a past, nor without traditions, and laws made in accordance with living principles have a way of *making* themselves respected. The fact that stones are hard and that fire will burn is not yet made a part of the regular course of teaching in our Common Schools.

The Fugitive Slave Bill is at present the favorite text of our political Talmudists. Here is an opportunity for us to sacrifice ourselves to our convictions of the sacredness of Law. An odd kind of vicarious martyrdom this, where Willian and Ellen Craft go to the stake, and *we* rise Phœnix-like from *their* ashes as Secretaries of State, Ambassadors, or Collectors with ten thousand a year. Such flames undergone by proxy are not so scorching, we fancy, as those of Smithfield. This way of employing a vice-martyr is an invention worthy of the age which gave birth to the electric telegraph. Suppose the position and the salary should also be enjoyed by substitute?

That is strangely enough called law which compels anarchy and renders illegality permanent. But it is the law, we are told, and therefore we must obey it. Besides, it is no worse than the law of '93. Small consolation, when we consider that an interval of fifty-seven years divides them. Excellent friends, you forget that the *Time When* materially affects the aspect of all human actions. You must introduce a bill at the next Session of Congress repealing and abolishing the Nineteenth Century. It is that which really stands in your way, and gives you so much trouble. It is that which has got into the legs of the slaves and the heads of the constituencies. We can understand a man who affirms his belief that Slavery is the natural condition of any part of mankind; but when one tells us that he believes Slavery to be wrong and unnatural, and at the same time would support a law intended to preserve it, we are at a loss. His notion must be that God and Destiny can be bound by a string of Caucus resolutions. It comes to mind now also, for the first time, that we *have* traditions and a past. Men are yet alive who felt the first thrill of that fateful Declaration, who can remember that famous war carried through "upon a preamble." There are descendants among us of those who sheltered Goffe, Whalley and Dixwell—ominous names, recalling the history of that King who resisted the progress of Events, who maintained privilege and prescription till the axe cut through life and prerogative together.

Mr. Webster has been filling the newspapers lately with certificates of the efficacy of his famous Union Pill ann Gunpowder Cement. He warrants his patent medicine as a conservative, but of what? Why the pill will enable a man to enjoy for years his excellent—bad constitution; it will maintain every one in the quiet possession of his time-honored—boil; it will secure the prolonged activity of our hereditary—scrofula. And the Gunpowder Cement? That needs no testimonials, for everybody knows what gunpowder will do.

"Resolved," say the London Aldermen, "that we will have, and of right ought to have, our ancient stenches and foul gases." Providence calls no public meetings and passes no resolutions that the Aldermen hear of, but bye and bye quietly comes in the Cholera. So it will be here. Preserve the Union by throwing coals into whatever is explosive in it, inculcate reverence for the Constitution by mumbo-jumboing forever before that part of it which is wholly unreverend, and in good time enter Insurrection and Disruption. Mr. Webster repeats everywhere Æsop's fable of the bundle of rods, and he might select a very handsome fagot, as an illustration, from those which Time has in pickle for him. But if he has ever been into a shop, he must have seen the pack-thread snap by being too tightly drawn around the parcel, and perhaps it might profit him to turn over in his mind this little fact in connexion with the fable. We did not get rid of George III. to enthrone a constitution as pig-headed as he. If we are to live, we must grow. The oak tree planted in the flower-pot, as Goethe says of Hamlet, must burst it or die.

J. R. L.

GEORGE THOMPSON.

As George Thompson, the "Fayette of the Anti-Slavery Cause" is now amongst us, and is about to receive a public reception from his friends in Boston, it will interest our readers to know how his friends abroad parted from him. The following report of a public meeting in London on his departure we copy from the *London Inquirer:*

VISIT OF MR. G. THOMPSON M. P., TO AMERICA.

On Wednesday evening a farewell *soirée* was given at the London Tavern, to Mr G. Thompson, M. P., previous to his departure on a visit to America. The company was extremely numerous and included a great number of ladies. The chair was taken by Sir Joshua Walmsley, M. P., who was supported by Messrs. G. Thompson, M. P., J. Williams, M. P., H. T. Atkinson, T. J. Serle. &c., &c. The company was addressed by Mr. Slack, Mr. W. Wells Brown (a fugitive slave), Mr. Serle, and Mr. G. Thompson himself. In the course of the proceedings, a farewell ode—solo and quartett—entitled "Farewell to a Friend of the People," was sung, the solo by Miss Cubitt. It was loudly encored, and in the second performance the whole assembly, standing, joined heartily in the chorus.

Mr. Brown in the course of his address said, that whatever laws might be passed, there was one part of America—Canada—where the fugitive slave would be protected from the hunt of the slave-owner. There were now in the Canadas some twenty-five or thirty thousand fugitive slaves, who, like himself, had fled from the stars and stripes, and taken refuge under the British flag. He had a mother and three sisters, who, if alive, were still clanking the chains of Slavery. It was indeed an anomaly that he should stand there [illegible] the American people. While they pretend to sympathise with the cause of freedom in the old world, their own capital was the greatest mart of Slavery in the world.—(cheers).

Mr. Thompson referring to his experience in connection with the Anti-Slavery cause, said that after West Indian emancipation had been gained, he was offered the means necessary to enable him to study for the bar. "He was proffered the aid of the first of living lawyers, and his family was to have been provided for until he was able to support them. He had nearly determined to accept this offer, when a glorious being visited this country from the shores of America; and if no other man had emanated from that country, he would honor it for his sake. America had given birth to William Lloyd Garrison—(cheers)—who came here to expose the artifices of those who were engaged in the mock abolition movement of colonising Africa with the people of the United States. Mr. Garrison and himself then became what they had continued since—friends and allies in the cause of freedom. Mr. Garrison's pen was then almost the only one employed in America in the cause of the slave; and he thought he might be aided by his (Mr. Thompson's) tongue. Without forgetting those whom he was bound to support, he said to his friend, 'Farewell the British bar if I can serve the cause of down-trodden humanity'—(immense applause). His American friends knew that he took from them neither silver nor gold; he enjoyed their hospitality; and talk of persecutions—he would endure them again and again, for one hour's intercourse with such noble men and women—(cheers). The land of Washington, of Allen, of Hancock, and last, but not least, of Garrison, would yet cast this polluted thing, Slavery, out of the camp, and consign it to the fire, nor 'leave one wrack behind'—(cheers). He did not leave America till the assassin's bowie-knife glittered before his eyes. He wanted again to see those noble women, who, as had been stated, were mobbed by five thousand gentlemen. Oh, that the women of England would take up the question of parliamentary and financial reform as these ladies had taken up the Anti-Slavery Cause. In that very city, where stood a hall, from the platform of which he was once denounced as a viper to be crushed, might now be seen during ten days at Christmas, one of the most magnificent bazaars in the world, and it was the proceeds of that bazaar mainly which supported the gigantic operations of the Anti-Slavery Society in America. His stay in America would not be long. He would not be unmindful of his solemn engagements in this country—(loud cheers).—He saw some present to whom he was partly indebted for representing as noble a constituency as any in the world. He should return to support his friend in the chair and other friends in the House of Commons in their struggle for the people's rights. He was not going to abandon the Tower Hamlets until the Tower Hamlets abandoned him—(cheers)—and he promised them that any rumors to the contrary notwitstanding, when the tocsin should sound, he would be found at his post."—(loud cheers).

JOHN A. COLLINS.—We observe that our old friend, and former General Agent of the Anti-Slavery Society, is on the Whig ticket as candidate for the Assembly in San Francisco. Let John A Collins fall into whatever crowd he may, it is not a great while before he rises head and shoulders above his neighbors, a mark for men's eyes and admiration. As we saw him once, some ten years ago, step upon a bench in a densely crowded hall, where not five persons knew him, and lift that thin, pale, sharp face of his above the level of the heads around him, and in his quick, shrill, piercing voice that goes off like the crack of a good rifle, cry out—"Mr. President!"—the sound running like a shock from a galvanic battery through the audience, creating a visible stir and a felt emotion before another word was spoken, before the brief, pertinent question came which hit, in a moment, the very point which others had shot at for hours, either unwilling or afraid to hit; so always let him be where he may, his restless temperament pushes him forward, his acute intellect, and vigorous character, make him known and felt at once as a man made for a leader, behind whom others fall involuntarily and at the sound of his voice. Had he as much steadiness of purpose, as he has strength and energy, John A. Collins would have been powerful for good or for evil; he has, indeed, done no little good, because his impulses are frequently right, but not a little evil also, because impulse is usually his motive. The Whigs of San Francisco are, we were about to say, lucky in their choice of him, but he being a Whig, and among them that they could not help; we may say however, that it is fortunate for them that he is not in the opposition. We hope he may be chosen, and if his party have not already found it out, we can assure them that they will not find a harder worker in it.

AMERICAN MINISTERS ABROAD.—It will surprise the American people to learn that they are represented in the Court of St. James, and at St. Cloud by Abolitionists; that the principles of Anti-Slavery which are so unpopular at home, and so certain to render all who hold them obnoxious, and a mark of opprobrium, are the very principles which American Ministers abroad are ready to avow. Even Mr. Rives, a Slaveholder, is ready to avow them when in England, and Mr. Abbott Lawrence, who is not considered an Abolitionist in Boston, is a very good one when he is in London. At all events a responsible statement made in a Belfast (Ireland) paper, amounts to that, and that our readers may see for themselves, we copy it It is made in a letter of Mr. James Standfield, dated Belfast, Sept. 26, 1850, and is as follows:—

In last month I had an interview with David Turnbull, Esq., one of the judges of the mixed court in Jamaica; he is on sick leave, his health having suffered much from residence in foreign climates. He is the editor of an interesting work, entitled "Movement for the enforcement of the slave trade treaties," for gratuitous distribution, the last and most important of which was negotiated by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—Earl Clarendon, when ambassador at the Court of Spain; and which treaty was based on the suggestions conveyed to the foreign office by Mr. Turnbull, when British Consul at Cuba,—the duties of which office he discharged so faithfully to the poor negroes, illegally held in bondage, that his life was endangered, and he had to sleep on board a British ship of war in the harbor of Cuba. Mr. Turnbull informed me that he lately met Mr. Rives in London, the American Minister at Paris, who has long represented Virginia in the Senate of the United States, and the owner of extensive tracts of land in Virginia, with a proportionate number of slaves; he expressed his readiness to promote manumission and removal of large numbers of them, as well as those of some twenty of his neighbors, as soon as he is made aware that the necessary arrangements were completed for their transit to the West Indies, and for their reception there; and I am happy to inform you that Mr. Turnbull has undertaken, I believe, the pleasing duty of having those poor slaves taken to Jamaica, where laborers are required, and where they will be no longer subject to the lash of the task-master, but be paid for their labor. Mr Lawrence, the American Ambassador to St. James's, told Mr. Turnbull that the system of slavery is now so unprofitable and burthensome in six of the fifteen slave States of the Union—namely, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Missouri, that they may hope the time will soon come when slavery will be abolished in those States. Mr. Rives entirely confirmed the statement of his colleague, Mr. Lawrence. Is not this cheering news, Mr. Editor? Well may the friends of human freedom praise God and take courage, let them persevere in a righteous agitation until slavery is abolished throughout the world.

Mr. Turnbull informs me that the House of Assembly in Jamaica consists of forty-seven members, ten of whom are colored, and two black gentlemen, and it is thought the next Speaker will be a colored man. What will the saucy Republicans of America think of this?—*the contemptible aristocrats of the skin.*

A MODEL SOCIALIST.—Robert Dale Owen, who has written, said, and in the way of Communities, attempted to do something to equalize the condition of men, and give them their rights, has just had his sincerity on these points tested. As Chairmen of the Committee on Rights and Privileges of Inhabitants he has reported to the Constitutional Convention of Indiana, a provision forbidding the immigration of negroes into the State, or their right to hold property therein. The chance is that this tyrannical provision will become a part of the fundamental law of the State, Mr. Owen thus leading the onslaught upon the first and simplest of all human rights, the right to exist. He is, nevertheless, a good representative of what is known, whether correctly or not, in the United States as Socialism, which always means simply *my* rights—not *yours* or *his*. The *Tribune*, we observe, expresses some disgust at this last act of Mr. Owen, but we venture to say that that paper—or rather its 'responsible editor'—is moved to indignation, not so much because Mr. Owen would basely betray the cause of human rights, as because he belongs to the Democratic party. There is nothing, we grant, on—we doubt if there is under,—God's earth anything more despicable than an old Hunker Locofoco [illegible] Tribune never forgets; but Mr. Greeley in reality approves of the course proposed to be adopted towards the colored people in Indiana, however much he may, for politic reasons, permit his paper to sneer at it. He has given within a few months his real opinion on this very question of driving the colored people out of the country, and Mr. Owen might have read it as good argument in favor of his report. The great difference between the two seems to be that one of them lives in Indiana, and the other in New York; that there anything said or done against the negro is very popular; here it is popular to advocate his rights, in a small way, though one need not, as Mr. Greeley has proved, fear much to let out, now and then, the true negro-hating spirit.

HONOR TO A COLORED MAN.—Amin Bey, the Turkish Envoy, has received the honor of a public dinner at Boston from the gentlemen of property and standing there, but the honor was tendered him, not as a man, not as Amin Bey, but as the Ambassador from the Sublime Porte to the Federal Government. As he is a colored man, darker, we suppose than Wm. Craft, and as dark as Douglass, of course he had a little table by himself in the corner, where his victuals were sent him, and was really at the dinner of the Boston gentlemen only in a Pickwickian sense. The colored people of Boston would thus be taught the proper place of the dark races, and could not presume and grew impertinent because one of the lower shade sat between Messrs. Webster and Winthrop. The spirit of constitutional obligations is better observed in Boston than to overstep the bounds of propriety and prescription in such matters.

THE BAPTISTS OF MICHIGAN.—The Baptists of Michigan at a State Convention recently held at Detroit, passed the following resolutions on the Bloodhound Bill without a dissenting voice:

Resolved, That as all government is of God, and as righteous rulers are promised to God's people, it is our duty to exercise the privilege of the elective franchise as praying men, and to acknowledge the supremacy of Jehovah, and our dependence on Him, by ever remembering in our prayers those who conduct the affairs of our civil institutions.

Resolved, That among the many objects which call for benevolent action, the enslaved population of this country, and the suffering fugitives in the adjoining provinces should not be forgotten, but should enlist the prayers and alms of all Christians in their behalf

Resolved, That the recent law of Congress relative to the recapture of Fugitive Slaves, violating as it does every guarantee of personal rights, setting aside all the ordinary forms of law, giving an exclusive regard to the interests of the slaveholder, and requiring freemen and Christians, in order to its enforcement, to violate their obligations to humanity, to conscience, and to God, is a flagrant violation of civil and moral rights, and calls for prompt and efficient effort on the part of all Christian citizens by all lawful measures to obtain its speedy repeal.

Such strong terms as these on the law certainly reflected in no small measure on those who made the law. Lewis Cass, did not it is true, vote on the Bill, but according to his ability no Northern man did more to bring about the state of things which had this result among others Yet these Michigan Baptists could so far stultify themselves, a day or two after, as to take up a collection of $35, for the American Foreign Bible Society, and pass relative thereto the following Resolution:

Resolved, That the collection taken up yesterday for the American Foreign Bible Society, be appropriated to constitute Hon Lewis Cass a life member of that Society."

Opposition to the Fugitive Slave Law is popular in Michigan; so is Cass; therefore Michigan Baptists oppose the Law, and endorse Cass, who made it, as an excellent Christian. This is a history in little of American christianity, morality, and politics.

PANORAMA OF SLAVERY.—The *London Inquirer* mentions the exhibition of a Panorama of Slavery in England by Wm. Wells Brown. Box Brown sailed for Liverpool from this port, a few weeks ago with a Panorama of Slavery, and the *Inquirer* probably mistakes him for W. W. Brown, who is lecturing in England. At least we have never heard that the latter is engaged in such an exhibition.

WHAT THE FRENCH THINK OF US.—A correspondent of a Philadelphia paper, writing from Paris, says that caricatures on American subjects abound in that gay city. He describes some of them in which Slavery is brought forward as the National characteristic. This writer does not know, or does not mention, what we are assured and believe to be true, that one of the most powerful arguments used in France against a Republic, and the one most relied upon by the anti-republican party, is the fact that the worst despotism in the world exists here under the professedly democratic government of the United States. They reason plausibly, if not justly, that the form of a republic is not incompatible with a tyranny worse than ever existed under the Bourbons; and that if France is to enjoy true liberty, she must look to a different and better model than exists in the United States. It is not at home only, but the world over that the genius of Freedom is bound to the earth by the fetters of the American slave. We observed in a recent number of a leading Parisian journal an admirably written article on the subject of Slavery in this country, in the course of which, to show its true character, and the character of the people who can tolerate and nurture such an institution, several atrocious advertisements were copied from Southern papers. The article excited, we are told, a good deal of sensation in Paris, and perhaps the caricatures thus described by the correspondent of the Philadelphia papec are its fruits:

One of them represents a smooth-faced, portly citizen of Philadelphia, easily to be recognized by his broad brimmed, low crowned hat, and the straight collar of his coat. He is followed by several negroes, each labeled "$1.000." He is a Friend going to the theatre where Jenny Lind is to sing, and taking money enough to buy a box ticket. A second picture represents a man mounted on a bench and gesturing and crying like an auctioneer. "Buy, ladies and gentlemen! going at half price, for almost nothing. Two lots, one is solid as a rock, the other as good as bread. Buy, buy'" Saying this, he touches with his hammer a placard on the front of a house and, with his hand, the head of a woman kneeling at his feet, with a rope around her neck and a wisp of straw in her hand. It is an American, who wishes to sell his store and wife to be able to buy a ticket for one of Jenny Lind's concerts.

Had the caricaturist been a little more familiar with our 'institutions,' he would, in the place of wife in the last named picture, put half a dozen young children, merchantable articles which many fathers in this country are in the habit of raising for the express purpose of sale.

☞ MRS. SEWALL, the wife of Samuel E. Sewall, and daughter of Nathan Winslow, of Portland, died suddenly, in Boston, on Monday evening of last week. She was in her usual health, as we learn from the *Chronotype*, but was taken with a sudden bleeding of the lungs, which soon terminated in death.

Mrs. Sewall has from childhood signalised herself by her devotion to the Anti-Slavery cause; and those who, for years, have been connected with it in and near Boston will miss her active co-operation and ready sympathy. More than this, however, she is taken, having hardly yet passed her youth, in the very prime of her life, and when most needful to her family, from a wide circle of friends whom the beauty and amiability of her character had called about her. For such bereavements there is no consolation.

THE FREE SCHOOL LAW.—The vote against the repeal of the Free School Law is estimated to be somewhere from 50,000 to 100,000. There is, at any rate, no doubt that it is very large, and secures universal education—except for colored folks—throughout the State.

MEETING AT MILTON.—We are requested to give notice that the Congregational Friends of Milton and Nine Partners propose to hold a Meeting at Milton, Ulster Co., on First Day the 17th inst. It is hoped that Friends interested will make an effort to attend

AMIN BEY, says an exchange, has requested the *Christian Watchman* to correct a misstatement, and to inform the world that he has only one wife. The Turkish envoy evidently thinks the American people less enlightened than they really are. If he had twenty wives, it would be no bar even to his becoming a member of the Christian Church, according to the doctrine of the A. B. C. F. M., and much less would such a piccadillo affect his respectability. He may enjoy privileges here which his poor unenlightened countrymen have not yet dreamt of; he may not only have as many wives as he pleases, but support his seraglio by the sale of the children, nor be considered any the less for that a republican and a christian.

WE had not, till a few days since, seen a full report of the proceedings of the late Episcopal Convention on Mr. Jay's motion for the admission of Colored Churches, but we now copy it, without further delay, from the *Protestant Churchman*. It seems hardly credible that even yet a body of professed Christians will refuse admission among them of other Christians of the same church, because of the color of their complexion, yet such is the fact. We wonder if these people believe that when the last trump sounds there will be a second blast for the 'colored brethren,' or whether, if there is not, they, the 'white brethren' will not get up to take seats in such a mixed Convention as will be likely to assemble,—"unless the priests cheat us laymen,"—on that day?

QUESTION OF ADMITTING THE COLORED CHURCHES TO UNION WITH THE DIOCESE.

In the Diocesan Convention, at St. John's Chapel, on Thursday, September 26th, 1850, the Report of the Committee on the Incorporation of Churches having been made and accepted, Mr. John Jay said:

I beg leave, Mr. President, before the Convention passes to the next order of business, to offer a resolution which I am advised by the honorable and learned delegate from Grace Church, (Mr. Bradish,) who is recognised here and elsewhere as the highest authority on such questions, to be strictly in order at the present time;—as relating to unfinished business, under the order of business now before us.

It will be remembered, sir, that in the year 1846, the church of St Philip, and the Church of the Messiah, both of the city of New York, whose congregations are composed of ~~colored persons~~, applied to be admitted into union with this Convention; that their applications were referred with those of other churches applying at the same time to the Committee on the Incorporation of the Churches, who reported that these parishes had been regularly incorporated according to law, and were entitled to admission; that the other parishes whose admission was recommended at the same time, were forthwith admitted; but that when the vote was about to be taken on the question of admitting these colored churches, an objection was raised by a learned delegate from Trinity Church (William H. Harrison, Esq.,) upon whose motion the subject was referred to a special committee with instructions to report thereon, at that Convention. Two reports were thereupon presented by the special committee then appointed. One, a majority report, recommending the exclusion of all colored churches which was signed by "William H. Harrison, Reuben Sherwood, and John C. Spencer," and the minority recommending their admission, signed by "Evan M. Johnson, and John A. King" Both reports were ordered to be entered upon the Journal, and laid on the table until the next Convention, when they were taken up and again laid upon the table without any action being had. These churches are in consequence still excluded, although properly entitled to admission pursuant to the report of the Committee on the Incorporation of Churches, which I now propose to take up for final disposition. It is time that the question was settled, both on account of the church at large, and also of these parishes. It involves great principles—of not mere abstract, but of practical importance—and affects the interests and welfare of a large class. It is a question which many will wish to postpone, but it is one which, although it may be delayed, cannot be avoided; and the responsibility of deciding it ought to be manfully met at once. In three Dioceses, those of Rhode Island, New Jersey, Michigan, colored churches have been admitted to union with the Convention, and their admission has been followed by no excitement, no difficulties, no inconveniences of any kind, and there is no good reason for anticipating any evils whatsoever from their admission here.

The arguments against their admission presented in the majority report of the special committee to which I had referred, strike me as being novel and extraordinary. They take the ground that "the question referred to them is *exclusively relating to the temporal government of the Diocese, and is wholly unconnected with the religious rights or duties of the applicants*," that "the Convention is *but a part of the civil machinery instituted by human wisdom*, for the purpose of regulating the Society, by which and for whose benefit it was established, and *no more a part of our church in this country in a religious view* than are the civil establishments and the connection with the government in England part of the church there." Starting with this hypothesis of the merely human and temporal character of the Convention, and its wide separation from the church in a religious view, they naturally infer that it is to be organized and governed by "considerations of expediency," and they liken it to any ordinary "body of men uniting together for a common purpose." "Among the considerations of expediency," they remark, "which any body of men uniting together for a common purpose, would deem the most important, must be that of determining with whom they would associate, and who should be permitted to participate in the government of the society," * * and "when society is unfortunately divided into classes—when some are intelligent, refined, and elevated in tone and character, and others are ignorant, coarse and debased, however unjust such debasement may be, and when such prejudices exist between them as to prevent social intercourse on equal terms, *it would seem inexpedient* to encounter such prejudices unnecessarily, and to endeavor to compel the one class to associate on equal terms in the consultation on the affairs of the diocese, with those whom they would not admit to their tables, or into their family circles—nay, whom they would not admit into their pews during public worship."

The committee then refer to the colored race, and declare it to be a "fact that they are socially degraded, and are not regarded as proper associates for the class of persons who attend our Convention." "We object not," they continue "to the color of the skin, but we question their possession of those qualities which would render their intercourse with the members of a Church Convention useful or agreeable even to themselves. We should make the same objections to persons of the same social class, however pure may be their blood, or however transparent their skin."

The committee then intimate that our present duty to this unfortunate race demands "extended and liberal efforts to improve their mind and their condition by intellectual culture, by religious instruction, and as they advance in intelligence and refinement, by relaxing the severities of *caste* which now separate us, until by degrees they become fitted for the duties and enjoyments of a higher social condition, and then admit them in our public and private intercourse to free and equal communion."

Now, sir, if we admit the correctness of this view, and the propriety of the test thus recommended, some, at least, of the representatives of these churches are entitled to admission. The Rev. Alexander Crummell, Rector of the Church of the Messiah, and the same gentleman who, on account of his complexion, was several years since rejected as a student of our Theological Seminary, at Chelsea, is now a member of that honorable institution, King's College, Cambridge. During his residence in England, he has preached in more British pulpits than have hitherto been filled by any American clergyman. He has been kindly received and welcomed at the houses of the learned and the noble; and when he returns to his parish, as I trust he soon will, crowned perhaps with collegiate honors—but better still with a mind filled, cultivated, and enlarged by the classic training of that ancient University, and a character and bearing elevated and refined by familiar intercourse with the great and the good of that glorious land, including many of the most eminent prelates and clergy of the British Realm,—we are bound to believe that when he comes thus accredited as "the possessor of those qualities, likely to render his intercourse with the members of this Convention agreeable and useful," the majority of this committee, the Rev. doctor from Hyde Park, the learned gentleman from Trinity, and the honorable delegate from St. Peter's, Albany, will receive him with open arms—that they will admit him, in the language of their report, both "in public and private intercourse, to free and equal communion," and welcome him with perfect cordiality to their pews and to their tables; and this they are to do without the slightest regard to his complexion, for they assure us distinctly, that they "object not to the color of the skin," and however astonished and mystified we may be at the novel doctrines broached in their report touching this Council of the Church, or as they are pleased to phrase it, "this civil machinery" of "our denomination," (!) it would not be in order for me to suppose for an instant that that assurance was given by these gentlemen simply on the ground of the human expediency, inculcated in their report, to give a specious coloring to a worthless argument, and without the honest intention of reducing their principles to practice, whenever the opportunity should occur.

Another individual who would be equally entitled to admission under the test recommended by the report, is Dr James McCune Smith, who, I believe, was appointed a lay delegate from the Church of St Philip.—Although born in New York, he was educated at the University of Glasgow, where he graduated with high honors, and so warmly was he esteemed in the more select circles of that city, that when he was about returning to America, he was honored by a public entertainment given by the most respectable citizens of Glasgow, as a token of their high regard for him as a gentleman and a scholar.

But passing by the case of Mr. Crummell and Dr. Smith, and of other intelligent and well educated members of their race, whom this committee, as I have shown, have pledged themselves to welcome whenever they appear, we claim admission for the representatives of all colored Churches duly organized within the Diocese, without any enquiry into their intellectual elevation, the refinement of their manners, or their possession of agreeable social qualities. And here, sir, we deny the entire premises of this report. We deny that the question is one exclusively relating to the temporal government of the Diocese, and wholly unconnected with the religious rights and duties of the applicants. We deny that the Convention is simply the civil machinery of the society by which it was established. We deny that it is analogous to mere human bodies of men, where any persons uniting together for a common purpose, may determine by considerations of expediency only with whom they will associate, and exclude all whose manners, education, or social position may be distasteful to the majority in the light of social companionship. I am inclined to allow these gentlemen the fullest credit for the originality of this newly-discovered test for admission to the Convention. It is indeed true that our Church has been sometimes styled an aristocratic and exclusive body, by men who were ignorant of her doctrines, and strangers to her courts—and we have always repelled the slander as injurious and untrue. It was reserved for this committee to give form and color to the charge, by gravely recommending to us to exclude these parishes canonically entitled to admission—not because they are unsound in the faith, or unfaithful in practice, but simply on the ground that it may be *questioned*,—mark their care in not stating it as a matter definitely determined—on the ground that it may be questioned, whether they are possessed of those qualities that would render them agreeable as associates—whether they are sufficiently elevated and refined to join our circle. The question of the admission of these churches is narrowed down in their report by the committee rejecting all considerations of race and color, to the simple query, are these delegates applying for seats, nice persons for a sociable party?

It is clear that if this is a proper test to be applied to these churches, it is a proper one for all others, "however pure their blood or transparent their skin;" and in addition to the Committee on the Incorporation of Churches, we should have another to report to us the social qualifications of the delegates who may be appointed. But this Convention, so far from being the mere temporal government of an ordinary society, based upon a worldly expediency, is a Council of the Church, and although the form of its proceedings is regulated by human wisdom, the true principles of its government are as inflexible and eternal as the throne of God.

Such is the doctrine taught us by the Church herself, in whose solemn words the congregations throughout the Diocese, have already implored "the Almighty and Everlasting God, who by His Holy Spirit did preside in the councils of the blessed Apostles, and has promised to be with His Church to the end of the world, to be present with *the Council of his Church here assembled in His name and presence*." They have "besought Him to save us from all error, ignorance, pride, and prejudice, and of His great mercy so to direct, sanctify, and govern us in our present work, by the mighty power of the Holy Spirit, that the comfortable doctrine of Christ may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed in all places to the breaking down of the kingdom of sin, satan, and death, till at length the whole of his dispersed sheep being gathered into one fold, shall become partakers of everlasting life through Jesus Christ our Saviour." If this be then *a Council of the Church*, what right have we to adopt a rule, or recognize a test of admission, which would have excluded some of the very Apostles themselves! With the example of Christ as our guide, descending from the Courts of Heaven to associate with the humblest and most despised of earth, with the warning to the Apostle—what God hath cleansed, that call not then common, and the injunction to ourselves to "honor all men,"—with the ever present remindings by the Church that God hath made of one blood all nations of men—that all earthly distinctions are swallowed up in the everlasting covenant—that there are no longer Greek nor Jew, bond nor free, but Christ all and in all—how can we, without an utter wilful disregard of our profession and our duty, drive from our doors these two parishes now asking for admission? Pride, prejudice, and the fear of the world may prompt us to exclude them. But the only question for us is, what does *duty* demand?

A bold attempt is made by this committee to reconcile pride and prejudice with duty. But what can the subtlest ingenuity offer in so plain a case. The first principle of Christianity, the last injunction of our ascended Saviour, "Love one another as I have loved you," demands their admission, and it is only by stri-

king at the foundation, by denying our Christian character, and regarding this council of the Church of God, as the mere civil government of a society, wherein human expediency is to be invoked instead of the guidance of the Holy Spirit—where our passions and our prejudices may be consulted to determine the measure of our love to man—where the communion of saints is made to depend upon affinity for social companionship, and where those whose agreeableness is questioned, are turned away with the recommendation to be found in this report, to have a Church or denomination of their own, and govern themselves in their own unrefined society;—it is only by such unhallowed arguments that the committee can maintain their recommendation—upon these alone, they ask us to degrade the Church, to dishonor our profession, and deliberately to sin against God, against our brethren, and against our own souls.

If we yield to their solicitations, backed as they are by the clamors of a cruel and ungodly mob without these sacred walls; if we thus insult the Great Head of the Church, and plunge, with our eyes open, into that error, ignorance, pride, and prejudice, from which we have besought Him to save us; if we accept this proffered guide of human expediency, instead of the dictates of His Holy Spirit; if, instead of gathering His dispersed sheep—those whom a heartless world has worried and torn—into one fold, we drive them forth when they seek to enter—then may we believe, and tremble as we believe, that we have done very much to prevent "the comfortable doctrine of Christ from being truly preached, truly received, and truly followed, to the breaking down of the kingdom of sin, satan, and death."

For so surely as steadfastness in unpopular truth, on the part of Christians, tends to enlarge and establish the kingdom of God on earth, as certainly does the treachery of professed Christians in yielding to the clamor of the multitude, strengthen and confirm the world in its ignorance and sin. And, sir, from my own careful observations, and the testimony of many persons in whose judgment I have confidence, I think there can be no manner of doubt, that the conduct of the American Church towards the colored people in these States, both at the North and at the South, in regarding with indifference their wrongs and their sorrows—in interposing no shield and administering no rebuke to the legalised and brutal oppression to which they are the innocent and unresisting victims, but on the contrary, lending to that oppression a direct sanction, encouraging a cruel and grinding prejudice, and recognizing in its councils and its temples a degrading caste, has so shocked the moral senses of thousands, that they have turned from the Church with involuntary distrust, and misjudging the holiness of its principles by the pride and prejudice of its members, have been beguiled into the sloughs of infidelity; finding partial consolation in the benevolence of worldly philanthropy, after being sickened and disgusted with the coldness and inhumanity of Churchmen towards their brethren of a darker hue.

The eyes of the world are now fixed upon this Convention; your proceedings are not done in a corner. If you reject these churches, weigh well the responsibility. It is not merely the denial of right to these two parishes, the violation of the unity of the Church, by refusing them admission—it is much more than this. It is the formal recognition of a system of *caste* in the Church, which God has expressly forbidden; it is a sanction of that *caste* as it exists in the world around us; an encouragement to the cruel oppressors; a cause of despondency to the oppressed. Where are the colored race, stripped as they are of their dearest personal rights, and hunted like beasts over our free borders—where are they to seek for succor if the Church forsakes them, and denies admission to her own acknowledged children; her own ordained ministers, sent forth to officiate before God, but deemed unfit to sit here in company with their fellow men? It will be a base surrender of our holiest principles, our most binding duties, to a dread of the world's displeasure, or a cowardly fear of the consequences, to the Church or to ourselves. It would be a base surrender of *our faith* to our fears, if knowing the Church to be founded on a rock, we dare to reason upon the expediency of obeying God's plain command. It will degrade us in our own estimation and in that of the world, for the world will see that the Church has no more principle, nor dignity, nor humanity, than themselves, and we shall know that we have committed a sin with our eyes open; an act, whose consequences and influences we can never stay, but which, having passed forever beyond our control, may continue to operate for evil from the moment of its commission until the judgment-day

In God's name let us free ourselves from unholy influences, and stand erect as Christians. Let us shake from us by His aid that miserable pride and prejudice from which we have besought him to save us. And not only as Christian gentlemen let us scorn the contemptible self-sufficiency that leads men of little minds to look down upon those who are beneath them in acquirements, in station, or in influence, but as members of a Council of the Church, looking to its Almighty Head for guidance, let us so act as to preserve its purity unmarred by the devices of expediency, its unity unbroken by caste or schism. Let us receive these parishes to our Convention, disregarding the circumstance of color in accordance with Catholic usage, apostolic precedent, and Christ's injunction. Let us welcome them the more warmly, because the world regards them coldly; let us exhibit the strength of our principles, by braving the sneers and frowns of all, whether in or out of the Church, and give practical occasion for the remark, as did the early Christians of the Church, "Behold how these brethren love one another."

I have risen to bring these questions before the Convention for its immediate action; and if it be in order, I would prefer that the vote be taken not upon the resolution that these churches be admitted, but upon the same question in the negative form of the resolution recommended for our adoption by a majority of the select committee in this report, now waiting for our action,—"That these parishes be not admitted."

Mr. William H. Harison demanded that the motion of the gentleman should be reduced to writing.

Mr. Jay said that the resolution of the committee was before the Convention, and he called for the vote upon it, and asked the Chair to decide whether he had not the right to do so

The Chairman (Dr. Creighton,) declared himself unprepared to determine this question.

Mr. Harison thought it a very clear case. This matter was postponed from 1846 to 1847, and then passed by. Not having been then acted upon, it could not be considered unfinished business, to be taken up as such by this Convention. It had long since fallen to the ground, and was altogether forgotten, and he thought it very unfair now to renew it without notice. He hoped if the matter were taken up, members would be allowed time to prepare themselves.

Mr. Bradish having been appealed to for advice upon the point of order, stated that the subject was undoubtedly unfinished business under the order of business before the Convention; but that not having been by resolution of a former Convention referred expressly to this Convention, it must be formally taken up by express resolution.

The Chair thereupon decided that the reports were not before the Convention, but that a resolution to consider them would be in order.

Mr. Jay then presented the following resolution:

Resolved, That this Convention do now proceed to consider the application for admission of the Church of St. Philip's, and the Church of the Messiah, New York, which were made to this body in the year 1846, and which were favorably reported upon by the Committee on the Incorporation of Churches.

Mr. Livingston raised a question of order on the presentation of the resolution, stating, as a reason, that it interrupted the prescribed order of business.

The Secretary (Rev. Dr. Haight) sustained the view that it was out of order on this ground, as the Convention had already passed beyond the order of the Incorporation of Churches, before this subject was introduced. The roll of delegates had been called intermediately.

Mr. Jay explained that he rose immediately upon the conclusion of the proceedings under the Report of the Committee on the Incorporation of Churches, but yielded from courtesy to the Secretary who was commencing to call the list of new delegates, that having nothing to do with the next regular order of business.

Dr. Anthon said that it was so, and that Mr. Jay was clearly entitled to the floor; he had risen before the Convention passed to a new order of business.

The Secretary was satisfied with this explanation, and withdrew his objection on the point of order.

The Chair announced the question to be on the resolution offered by Mr. Jay.

Hon. J. C. Spencer rose to a question of order, and contended that there was no application from these churches for admission, upon which the Convention could act. The applications referred to in the reports were made four years since, and have never been renewed. The parishes may have ceased to exist, or may no longer desire admission; a new application was clearly necessary.

Mr. Jay said he was well aware that there were many gentlemen on that floor determined to avoid, if possible, being brought to a direct vote upon this question, but this new objection seemed to him unfair,—These churches applied for admission in the proper form, their application was referred to the Committee on the Incorporation of Churches, who reported that they were entitled to admission. The subject was then referred to the Special Committee, whose reports were laid over for one year, and then again laid upon the table, where they are lying now, only waiting the passage of this resolution to be taken up. How can it be said with truth that there are no applications before us? Have they been withdrawn? We know that they have not. Had these churches supposed that we required a new application they would have made it; as it was, they had good reason to believe that a new application would be deemed disrespectful, as indicating impatience at our delay in deciding upon the applications already before us. This Convention have the power to exclude these churches if they think fit to do so; but let it be done in a fair way by a direct vote, and not under the cover of the technical objections and points of order such as this.

The Chairman ruled that the objection was well taken, that there was no application before the Convention and that consequently, the resolution was out of order.

Mr. Jay respectfully appealed from the decision of the chair.

The Chairman stated the question before the House to be on the appeal from his decision.

Dr. Hawks maintained at some length that the decision was in strict conformity to parliamentary usage; that a departure from it would lead to great inconvenience in the unexpected introduction of matters long past by, and expressed the hope that the members of the Convention would not depart from the rule of looking to the record to determine what matters were in order, but would sustain the decision of the Chair.

Mr. Jay said he rose to withdraw the appeal he had taken, and begged leave at the same time to give notice that he would take an early opportunity of renewing his motion for the admission of these churches on a new application, and that he hoped the question would then be decided upon its merits.

Communications.

Castle Garden vs. Blackstone.

One orator said, "The master has the same claim to "the services of the slave, as you have, as parents, to "the obedience of your children."

This is the language of Sandford, an orator who made a speech on that memorable evening.

Now let us hear another man quite as renowned in his day as any of the orators at Castle Garden claim to be. He says:

"Pure and proper Slavery does not, nay cannot, subsist in England, such I mean whereby an absolute "and unlimited power is given to the master over the "life and FORTUNE of the SLAVE. And, indeed, it is "repugnant to reason, and the principles of natural "law, that such a state should subsist anywhere. The "three origins of the right of Slavery, assigned by "Justinian, are all of them built upon false foundations. "As, first, Slavery is held to arise '*jure gentium*,' from "a state of captivity in war; whence slaves are called "*Mancipia, quasi manu capti*. The conqueror, say "the civilians, had a right to the life of his captive: "and, having spared that, has a right to deal with him "as he pleased. But it is an untrue position, when "taken generally, that by the law of nature, or nations, "a man may kill his enemy: he has only a right to "kill him, in particular cases; in cases of absolute necessity, for self defence; and it is plain this absolute "necessity did not subsist, since the victor did not "actually kill him, but made him prisoner. War "is itself justifiable only on principle of self-preservation; and therefore it gives no other right "over prisoners but merely to disable them from doing "harm to us, by confining their persons; much less "can it give a right to kill, torture, abuse, plunder, or "even to enslave, an enemy, when the war is over. "Since therefore the right of *making* slaves by captivity depends on a supposed right of slaughter, that "foundation failing, the consequence drawn from it "must fail likewise. But, secondly, it is said that Slavery may begin '*jure civili*,' when one man sells "himself to another. This is only meant of contracts, "to serve or work for another, is very just; but when "applied to strict Slavery, in the sense of the laws of "old Rome or Modern Barbary, is also impossible. "Every sale implies a price, a quid pro quo, an equivalent given to the seller in lieu of what he transfers "to the buyer: but what equivalent can be given for "life, and liberty; both of which, in absolute Slavery, "are held to be at the master's disposal? His property also, the very price he seems to receive, devolves "*ipso facto* to his master, the instant he becomes his "slave. In this case, therefore, the buyer gives nothing and the seller receives nothing: of what validity then can a sale be, which destroys the very principles upon which all sales are founded? Lastly, we "are told, that besides these two ways by which slaves "'*fiunt*' or are acquired, they may also be hereditary: "'*servi nascuntur*;' the children of acquired slaves are "*jure naturæ*, by a negative kind of birthright, slaves "also. But this, being built on the two former rights, "must fall together with them. If neither captivity, "nor the sale of one's self, can by the law of nature "and reason reduce the parent to Slavery, much less "can they reduce the offspring. (1. Blackstones commentaries, p. 423.)

It appears to us that Dr. Blackstone is quite as good authority as any of the late orators at Castle Garden.

MADISON.

Public Meeting.

A large and enthusiastic meeting of the colored citizens of Canandaigua was held at the Court House on the evening of the 31st of October, for the purpose of adopting measures in relation to their action on the Fugitive Slave Bill, passed at the recent session of Congress. The meeting being called to order, on motion, Mr. Austin Steward was appointed Chairman, and A. Steward, Jr. Secretary; and, on motion of Mr. H. W. Johnson, M. A. Blake and A. Haley were appointed Vice Presidents.

On motion the Bill was read, and a Business Committee of five was appointed and retired.

Mr. Rankin, of Ohio, then addressed the audience. The Committee then returned and reported their resolutions, they were read by the Chairman of the Committee. Mr. H. W. Johnson then arose, and in a very able manner examined the prominent features of the odious Bill, proving conclusively its unconstitutionality. It was moved that the thanks of the citizens be returned to the Sheriff of the County for his kindness in opening the house for our reception: carried. On motion it was passed that the proceedings of this meeting be published in the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, the meeting then adjourned.

A. STEWARD, President.
A. Steward, Jr., Secretary

Foreign Correspondence.

From our Dublin Correspondent.

Dublin, Oct. 18th, 1850.

My Dear Gay: It is a long time since we heard from each other, but you have been, nevertheless, the frequent companion of my thoughts, particularly within the last few days, in which I have been silently thanking you for the attention you showed the lad of my Irish friends that I recommended to your good offices. I have had my hands of late so full of "books and works," though not much of "healthful play," that I have not had much time for writing; but I need not fill up the little space at my command just now with empty apologies. So here for.

I don't know any thing that has happened since you last heard from me that excited so much stir in the three kingdoms as the mobbing of Marshal Haynau by Barclay & Perkins' draymen. If any thing can be said to stir London, it stirred London. I recollect nothing of the kind which has excited such general complacency in the British islands since Nicholas Nickleby threshed Mr. Squeers. You recollect how every body was pleased. The Sunday morning after the latter memorable event, I happened to be walking behind a pair who, I suppose, were going to church, and I overheard the gentleman say to the lady, in tones of unsuppressed exultation, "Oh, did not he give him a capital dressing?" In fact, Dickens filled three kingdoms with delight by his veracious history of that fact. And so did Barclay & Perkins' draymen, by the tumultuous uprising of their indignant humanity. The *Times*, the *Morning Chronicle*, the *Morning Post*, and all the champions of absolutism amongst the London Daily press, stormed and raved; but still John Bull shook and chuckled in the immensity of his satisfaction. I was in London shortly after, and had the great pleasure of seeing the illustrious Joseph Mazzini, the Roman triumvir, there. I heard (but not from himself) that he attached very great value to the draymen's demonstration, believing that it would show unmistakably the feelings of the English masses towards such monsters as Haynau and the wretches that employed him and hounded him on. I have read even of peace meetings in which, while they condemned the act, the speakers (clergymen and Friends included) spoke of it in such terms as plainly proved that they were decidedly more pleased than vexed. Indeed, with the most intensely virtuous, if in all, it is excessively difficult, under some circumstances (and this was one of them), for the heart to stay behind for the head.

It is only yesterday I heard that George Thompson is likely to visit the United States immediately, and he may probably sail in the same ship that will be the fortunate owner of this beautiful epistle. I shall be extremely anxious to hear what reception he will get in the country that hunted him from her shores 15 years ago. I am confident that, as an Abolitionist, he is unchanged. Whether the popular feeling of the American people on this subject is altered for the better, his visit will prove. This visit must be intensely interesting to him. Notwithstanding all we have heard (I have no doubt truly) of the amelioration of the popular mind in consequence of the efforts of the Abolitionists, all who read the Anti-Slavery papers at a distance from the field of your labor must feel that there is an immensity to be done before Slavery ceases to be what it is now, the corner stone of your republican edifice, and that popular and gifted statesman, can safely drag the whole American people, except the Abolitionists, through the dirt to any extent, provided the object be to protect and foster the beloved "peculiar institution." When any particularly hateful, immoral, unpopular act passed the British Parliament, before the passage of the Reform Bill, it was easy to attribute it, and with truth, to Court, or Church, or Aristocracy, and the people washed their hands of it. Since the Reform Bill, no act very unpopular to the mass of the intelligent portion of the British people can pass the British Parliament. I cannot comprehend how such an infamous enactment, as the Fugitive Slave Bill, so vile in its provisions, and so horribly hostile to the plainest claims of humanity, justice, and fair play could have passed the American Congress after such full deliberation, unless it had the consent of the greatest and most influential portion of the American people. The Abolitionists need great hearts to be able to maintain and to hope for the eventual triumph of right while the victory of evil is so astoundingly rampant. I wish George Thompson all the happiness he anticipates from the sight of so many of his warmest, truest and best friends I am sure he must feel delighted to see so many who were witnesses, in former years, of his noblest efforts and his greatest triumphs. For my part, he was the first to create a warm interest on behalf of the Anti-Slavery cause in my mind, and I have to thank him for my acquaintance with many whom I honor most highly, and to whose friendship I am continually indebted.

You remember my friend that you visited in New York, and who passed on at once to Ohio. Well, they have had a dull time of it since they settled as "free and enlightened" citizens of the Model Republic. They have had fever and ague, and hard work, and a great want of old faces, and not very much congenial society, and plenty of democracy; and I am not quite clear they would not like to be back again. May-be it is only the seasoning, and perhaps, after the hard experience they have had at the first going off, all may go on smart and smooth in the time to come. I am sure I hope so. But I would not like to follow, except for a visit. I am too old to begin to wield the axe. If I tried, I should probably fare no better than the Queen's county mower that Sir Jonah Barrington tells of. He was walking home one day along the banks of the river Barrow, with his scythe over his shoulder. Seeing a fine salmon in the water, he lifted up the handle of the scythe (forgetting the blade) and attempted to spear the fish. With the force of the blow he cut his own head off, to the horror of some millers who saw the hapless member roll over the mill dam, a little way down. I don't vouch for this story of Sir Jonah's; but no doubt it is fully as true as a great deal that passes for very good history.

I wish you would tell your Boston Correspondent that I am forever obliged to him for his account of the Mock Funeral of General Taylor in Boston. It was the strangest piece of old children's play I ever heard of. What a strange sight it must have been to see a multitude of men of mature age, the lineal descendants of the grim puritans who hanged Marmaduke Stevenson and Mary Dyer, making a child's holiday over the empty coffin of the fine old fellow, who, when alive, had 300 niggers of his own to larrup, "gave Hell" to the Mexicans, and was full of indignation against Haynau, who was mobbed by the London draymen for presiding over the flogging of a single white Hungarian. If the draymen knew but all, they would find plenty of Haynaus to mob among the Southern Chivalry who visit the Brewery from time to time. Some great men absorb the celebrity that belongs to other people. Some great villains get more disgrace than properly belongs to them. I have no doubt if Ellen Craft were consulted, she would tell you of plenty of Haynaus in Georgia.

Yours ever truly,
RICH'D D. WEBB.

MISCELLANEOUS.

IMPORTANT DEBATE IN THE VIRGINIA CONVENTION ON THE EXPULSION OF FREE NEGROES.

On motion of Mr. Whittle, the House took up the following resolution offered by him yesterday: on his motion, the blank was filled with the word "seven.',

Resolved, That a committee of seven members be appointed to enquire into the expediency of inserting a clause in the constitution, declaring void all laws now in force, by which slaves who may hereafter be emancipated, and their decendants, may be permitted to remain within the limits of the commonwealth; and to restrain the Legislative department of the government from passing any law granting, permission to any such emancipated slave, or his or her descendants, to remain within the commonwealth; and to provide that it shall be competent to the Legislature to pass laws for the removal of free negroes and mulattoes beyond the limits of this commonwealth, either with or without the consent of said free negroes and mulattoes.

Mr. Whittle offered some reasons why this resolution should be referred to a special committee. He thought the large number of subjects which had been referred to the legislative committee, would prevent that committee from examining it as fully as its great importance demanded. It was a question which involved the peace of the Society of our state. It concerned a tribe of people among us, who were potent for evil and impotent for any good.

Mr. Lyons offered the following amendment, to come in after the word "Commonwealth," which was accepted by Mr. Whittle

"And after the lapse of twelve months, no deed or will emancipating slaves, shall be admitted to record in any court of this state."

Mr. Lyons said the object of his amendment was not to prevent any man from emancipating, in a proper way, his slaves during his life time, but to prevent a man, who, after getting all the labor from his slaves during his life time, at the time of his death seeks to get a posthumous reputation by emancipating his slaves and to save the community from the evil which was inflicted upon it by free negroes. Besides this, these emancipations at the time of death were frequently urged by the enemies of Slavery, as an evidence of repentance for having committed the sin of holding slaves and he desired to put a quietus upon even the suspicion of this being true.

Mr. Byrd desired time to look into this resolution, as it might regulate his vote upon it. He moved to lay it, as amended, on the table. Motion rejected.

Mr. Neeson offered the following amendment:

"Also to report the proper method of defraying the expenses of deporting such free negroes and mulattoes, as may be removed under any act of the Legislature."

Mr. Botts regarded this as a very important question—the disposition which was to be made of this class of people. He was little disposed, nor prepared to enter into an argument upon the question. But for the present, for the purpose of testing the sense of the House, he would offer the following, as a substitute for the resolution.

(The resolution is inserted below.)

Mr. Hopkins of W., hoped that the resolution, if adopted, would go to the legislative and not a special committee. He saw no reason for varying from ordinary committee.

Mr. Whittle urged that the legislative committee was not properly constituted to give a proper consideration to the question. He deemed it of sufficient importance to be put to rest by a constitutional provision. All he wished was to give the Legislature the power to act if it should become necessary, in this particular. He did not propose, as the member from Marion's amendment indicated, to engraft any system upon the constitution, but merely to declare a general principle, which was all that ought to be done when a body was going to write the law in iron. This tribe of people had increased in our State to an alarming extent. They were adverse in feeling, adverse in sentiment, and adverse in interest, to every community in which they are found. They had increased some 47 per cent. in the West, and some 7 or 8 per cent in his own district.

Mr. Stewart of Morgan, had been a member of a committee in the Legislature on this subject, and remembered that the examination made at that time on the subject of free negroes, fully confirmed all that had been said by the member from Pittsylvania.

Mr. Straughan offered the following as an amendment to the amendment of Mr. Neeson:

"And to purchase territory from the Federal Government, in latitude south of 35 degrees, upon which to locate such free negroes and mulattoes, as may be expelled from this Commonwealth."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. Neeson's amendment was also rejected.

Mr. Botts then modified his substitute, explained the difference between it and the resolution of the member from Pittsylvania; and expressed his dissatisfaction and disapprobation of the resolution. In his judgment, it proposed to interfere with the vested rights of such of these free negroes as had obtained permission to remain in the commonwealth. He was desirous of acting upon this subject, but not with cruelty or harshness. Here might be a man who, at the time of his death, might emancipate his slaves—they might be old and infirm, and yet you proposed to separate them from their families and friends without providing means for their transportation.

Mr. Lyons explained his amendment.

Mr. Whittle appealed to him to withdraw it. He feared it would embarrass his proposition.

Mr. Strother urged the adoption of the resolution of the member from Pittsylvania. He was prepared, whenever the proper time arrived, to see a law passed in obedience to its provisions. These free negroes were not citizens; they had none of the rights of citizens; they are not an integral portion of our community; and their presence among us induces a disease which is eating into the very bowels of the body politic.

Mr. Sheffey was opposed to the bad precedent which would be established by creating these special committees, and hoped they would not be raised.

Mr. Hopkins of W., moved to amend the resolution, so as to make it one of reference to the "Legislative Committee."

Mr. Ferguson offered a resolution creating a standing committee on slaves, the free negroes and mulattoes of the commonwealth. (Afterwards withdrawn.)

Mr. Botts did not desire to embarrass the proposition of any member, nor to stifle inquiry. He withdrew his amendment, and would offer it separately.

Mr. Taylor demanded the ayes and noes upon the motion of Mr. Hopkins, of W. to strike out a portion of the first line of the resolution, and to make an insertion so as to make it a resolution of reference to the legislative committee. The vote stood as follows: ayes 100, nays 50.

The amendment of Mr. Hopkins, of W. was adopted.

Mr. Whittle's resolution as amended, was then adopted.

Mr, Botts's resolution was adopted, and is as follows:

Resolved, That the committee on the Legislative Department of the Government be instructed to inquire into the expediency of providing, that no slave hereafter to be emancipated shall be entitled to his or her freedom, unless the person so emancipating such slave or slaves shall first make provision for his or their removal beyond the limits of the United States, or for the support of such as may be authorised by the Legislature to remain within the Commonwealth.

Mr. Lyon's resolution was adopted, and is as follows:

Resolved, That the committee on the Legislative Department be instructed to inquire into the expediency of inserting in the Constitution a clause providing that no deed or will emancipating a slave or slaves, shall be admitted to record in any Court in this Commonwealth so far as it does emancipate such slave or slaves.

——The present number of postmistresses in the United States is eighty-one.

——The Rev. Dr. Wardlow, the celebrated Scotish divine, arrived at Boston by the last steamer.

——The Indiana Convention have rejected the proposition to allow negroes the elective franchise, by a vote of ayes 1 noes 124.

——Resignation.—Reade Washington Esq., of Pittsburgh, of the family of Gen. Washington, has resigned his office of U. S. Commissioner, as he will not serve under the Fugitive Slave Law.

——The (Washington,) "*Republic*" says: "the citizens of Boston can preserve their own peace and order, and will preserve them at all hazards to the last extremity, but if unfortunately an emergency should occur in which the aid of the President may be required, it would be given without hesitation to the full extent of his Constitutional powers.

——At the Circuit Court of Culpepper county, Va, on Monday week last, the Grand Jury were sworn, and a number of witnesses summoned in the case of those who, some time ago, took out of prison and hung the free negro, Wm. Grayson. After deliberation, the Grand Jury refused to make any presentment.

——Slave Hunter Killed by a Fugitive.—John A. Butler of Edgefield District, S. C. was killed on the 23d ult. by two runaway slaves which he was in chase of, and was about to flog for having fled from their proprietors.

——Mr. Jenkins (The Tribune's Mrs. Harris) has discovered that the bill which recently passed Congress in regard to Oregon, provided that all *white* male citizens of the United States, or persons who shall have made a declaration of intention to *become such*, are entitled to a certain portion of land in the far-off Territory, and he, Mr. Jenkins, desires to know (says the Tribune) if Mr. Barnum's negro, who is now undergoing the process of "becoming such," has put in his claim.

——A Good Runner.—Some of our contemporaries (says the *Post*, which will not let poor Brooks alone) express their surprise that Brooks should have run so well in his district. If they had seen him run when the Fugitive Slave Bill came up in the House last summer, they would think nothing of this. But if they wish to see tall running, let them wait till next winter, when the question is taken on the repeal of that law.

——An Executive Anecdote.—The following anecdote is told in a letter from the Washington correspondent of the *Richmond Enquirer*. It confers credit on the President, and it gives us pleasure to transfer it to our columns.

"A distinguished gentlemen from the West—an Ex-Senator—called on Mr. Fillmore, and, after exchanging the usual courtesies, was asked by the President how the Fugitive Slave Bill was received in the West. The reply was, that the law, although unpopular in his State, would doubtless be enforced. The remark was playfully made, that, as the President was sworn to 'preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and laws.' he [the Ex-Senator) presumed Mr. Fillmore would execute *this law* 'To the very letter, sir,' was the instant reply of the President—'to the very letter, sir, whatever may be the consequences.' This reply was worthy the palmiest days of 'Old Hickory' himself.—*Washington Union.*

——Another Anecdote.—It gives us pleasure to state another anecdote about the President, for which we vouch, as we had it from two genilemen from the West, with whom the President had just been in conversation yesterday morning. They were applying to him for the appointment of a gentleman as attorney for the United States in one of the Western States. After discussing the qualifications of the candidate, Mr. Fillmore remarked that there was another thing which he deemed indispensable. He said he was determined to execute faithfully the Fugitive Slave law, and would appoint no man to office, who might be called upon to assist in the administration of that law, who would not zealously cooperate in its execution.

On another occasion, we understand from good authority, that the President declared that the law should be executed at every hazard—even at the risk of blood.

This is the spirit alone in which the Union can be preserved.—*Ibid.*

——Fugitive Slave Law at the North.—It has been estimated by the author of a pamphlet published not long since, at Washington, under the name of "Randolph of Roanoke," that the number of fugitive slaves who have escaped from the South between 1810 and 1840, and taken residence in seven free States of the North, amounts to 46,224—and that 15,400 have escaped between 1840 and 1850—making a total of 61,624, in forty years, or at the rate of 1540 in every year. Valuing each slave at $450, the annual loss has been $693,000, and the total loss $27,730,803.

The basis of calculation assumed is the difference between the actual increase of the free black population of the North, from one census to another, and what the increase would have been if left to natural causes. The writer also estimates that considerably more free negroes migrate from the free States to the slave States than from the slave to the free States.

——A Strike against Color.—Yesterday morning (says a Tribune last week) Mr. Dennis Harris employed a colored man to wheel dirt from beneath the large building he is now erecting in Duane st. This was the signal for about sixty or seventy Irishmen engaged as laborers to strike at once and refuse to work unless the colored man was summarily dismissed. Mr. Harris decided that the poor man, the unwilling cause of this trouble, should be continued at any rate. The strikers afterward offered to make up a purse for the colored man, if he was dismissed. But, said Mr. Harris, ten thousand dollars cannot purchase his dismissal. Consequently, the building stood yesterday almost silent. Mr. Harris has formerly had to take the same stand in favor of Irishmen with whom some Germans refused to work, and vice versa.

——How Signatures were Obtained.—The following is one instance among many of the sort showing how signatures to the call for the great 'Peace' Meeting were canvassed for:

Mr. Becker, a trunk-seller in his store. Enter Mr. Bland, a dry goods jobber:

Mr. Bland. Good morning, Mr. Becker! Will you just give us your name to the call for the 'Union' meeting, to sustain the Constitution and laws, and put down Anti-Slavery agitation?

Mr. Becker. I should want to think a while first. On the whole, I don't see any need of such a meeting, and I guess I won't sign.

Mr. Bland. You do, eh? Well, Sir! *I have orders to fill for trunks sometimes, and I guess I shall look for them elsewhere hereafter.*

Mr. Becker. Of course, Mr. Bland! If you suppose you buy *me* in buying my trunks, I trust you will be sure to patronize somebody else in future. [Exit Bland, huffy.]

Such was the purport of a conversation which actually took place. We have changed the names, and the article dealt in by Becker, but nothing essential.—*Tribune.*

RECEIPTS FOR THE STANDARD.

From October 1, to November 1, 1850.

590	Nathan Page, Danvers New Mills Mass.	2 00
538	Richard C. Warner, N. Y. City,	4 00
564	Peter Wilson, N. Y. City,	1 00
540	Geo. P. Bradfield, Jamaica Plain, Mass.	2 00
592	B. Poland, Boston Mass.,	2 00
554	James J. Cornell, Peruville N. Y.	1 00
539	S. S. Hicks, Washington Hollow N. Y.	1 20
539	Isaac Holmes, Pleasant Valley N. Y.	1 50
552	T. Jones, Cleaveland O.	1 00
558	F. J. Higginson, Brattleboro Vt.	2 00
536	Elizabeth B. Chase, Valley Falls R. I.	2 00
540	L. Gibbs, Greenwich N. Y.	1 36
540	Samuel Travis, Quaker Springs N. Y.	1 00
493	Mrs. Maria Butman, Worcester Mass.,	2 00
563	Daniel Clapp, Gardner Me.	2 00
589	D. W. Cole, Fairfield N. Y.	2 00
540	John Bulkly, Marlboro, N. Y.	1 40
578	Thomas McClintock, Waterloo, N. Y.	2 00
546	A. Palmer, "	1 00
564	Joseph Congden, New Bedford, Mass.	3 00
565	Samuel Woodruff, Ludlowville, N. Y.	2 00
587	O. B. Fisher, East Hamburg, N. Y.	2 00
568	Nicholas Vesper, Abington, Mass.	1 00
573	C. Donaldson, Cincinatti, O.	4 00
573	F. Donaldson, Swansea, England,	3 00
541	Elihu Slocum, Kings Ferry, N. Y.	3 25
573	Eliza Thaxter, Hingham, Mass.,	2 00
590	Elizabeth Cushing, "	2 00
590	Mary Tidmarsh, "	2 00
581	Lydia Andrews, "	2 00
590	Rhoda Beal, "	2 00
521	Rev. Geo. M. Rice, Eastport, Me.	2 00
542	L. B. Cowles, Austinburgh, O.	3 00
586	E. H. Payson, Salem Mass.,	2 00
572	A. C. Macy, Hudson, N. Y.	2 00
		$69 71

DONATIONS.

E. M. Davis, (pledge)	$100 00
Henry Grew, (pledge)	20 00

MARRIAGES.

Austin—Macy.—On the 4th inst., by his Honor the Mayor, William R. Austin, of Boston, to Lydia H., daughter of Josiah Marcy.

Frost—Goodell.—At Honeoye, Ontario County, N. Y., by Rev. William Goodell, Mr. Lewis P. Frost, Minister of the Gospel at Apulia, Onondago Co., to Miss Maria C. Goodell, daughter of Rev. William Goodell of Honeoye.

Buckingham—Nichols.—In Bridgeport, Conn., Oct. 31, by the Rev. H. W. Bellows, of New York city, Rev. John A. Buckingham, of Cambridge, Mass., to Georgiana A., daughter of Dr. B. Nichols, Esq., of Savannah, Ga.

Deblois—Grant.—In Philadelphia, Oct. 29, Stephen G. Deblois, of Boston, to Amelia D., daughter of Samuel Grant, of P.

Diller—Ridgway.—In Philadelphia, on the 31st ult., by a Friends' ceremony, in the presence of Charles Gilpin, Mayor, Rowland W. Diller, of Springfield, Illinois, to Esther C., daughter of the late Joseph Ridgway, of that city.

Robinson—Trumbull.—In Hartford Ct., October 21, Lucius F. Robinson, Esq., to Eliza Storrs, only daughter of Gov. Trumbull.

DEATHS.

Salisbury.—At Weymouth, Mass, 20th inst., Wm. Salisbury, a graduate at Harvard University in the class of 1795, and Pastor of a Church in Jefferson, N. J., aged 75.

Butler.—At Little Rock, Ark., Dr. Wm. Butler, Cherokee Agent, and formerly member of Congress from S. Carolina.

Singellton.—In Grahamsville, S. C., 21st ult., R. W. Singellton, Esq., member elect to the House of Representatives.

Deshong.—On board steamer City of Toronto, on the passage from Kingston to Toronto, P. M. Deshong, the celebrated mechanical ready reckoner.

Martin.—At the Union Place Hotel, in this city, on Friday, the authoress, Mrs. Bell Martin, of Ireland. The deceased had but recently arrived in America, which she intended to traverse for the purpose of procuring material for a book. On the voyage hither she suffered a miscarriage.

Graves.—At Bristol, R. I., on Sunday last. Rev. H. A Graves, formerly editor of the Christian Reflector, aged 37.

Loring.—In Boston, Oct. 31, Caleb Loring, Esq., 86.

Parker.—In Burlington, Vt. Oct. 30, Mrs. Sylvia A., wife of Rev. Hervey I. Parker, of Burlington, and youngest daughter of the late Philip Ammidon, Esq., of Boston, 35.

RECEPTION MEETING.

On Friday evening next, Nov. 15th, a public meeting will be held in this city—probably in FANEUIL HALL—by the friends of Liberty, Peace, Philanthrophy, Reform, and Progress, to welcome the arrival among us of GEORGE THOMPSON, Esq., M. P., on a temporary visit to this country, and to express to him their warm appreciation of his indefatigable and powerful labors for the abolition of chattel Slavery throughout the world—the moral elevation and political enfranchisement of the laboring classes in Great Britian—the protection of the natives of India from British injustice and oppression—and the promotion of the cause of human brotherhood universally. Addresses may be expected, on the occasion, from Wendell Phillips, Frederick Douglass, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, and others, and a fitting response from Mr. Thompson. Large as Faneuil Hall is, it will be much too small to contain the thousands who are impatiently waiting for an opportunity to see and hear this untiring philanthropist and distinguished orator: and by their enthusiastic reception of him, to indicate how great has been the change wrought in public sentiment since his sojourn here during the memorable period of 1834–5. The meeting can hardly fail to be one of the most thrilling interest, or to amply repay attendance from any and every part of New England.

It was desirable that a more prompt reception of Mr. Thompson should have been given; but in consequence of the pending State election, and in order to avoid even the appearance of seeking to influence parties in respect to it, it has been deemed judicious to defer the meeting until the election shall have fully transpired.

ANTI-SLAVERY BAZAAR.

The Committee beg leave to present a few additional statements to the consideration of such friends as have hitherto assisted us by furnishing table from their respective towns.

We confidently trust that all such will continue their efforts, taking no discouragement from the circumstance that *all* the articles hitherto contributed may not have found a market at the Boston Bazaar. Their sale at various country Fairs has produced an equal amount of good to the Cause. Nor are we convinced of anything more fully than that the number of sales at any Bazaar is in exact proportion to the number and variety of the articles displayed. We are careful to mention this, because the donations of our Trans-Atlantic friends have been so generous as to create an impression, in some minds, that it may be wise to diminish our own labors, particularly in those departments of Embroidery and Fancy Needle Work in which our contributors of Great Britain so highly excel. This opinion is erroneous. All donations of this kind are as needed and saleable as ever. Useful articles of every kind are desirable, and we hope that friends from the country towns may furnish larger supplies of Stockings, Mittens, etc., than heretofore, as we have never been able in this respect to meet the demand.

Any donations of materials, such as silk, cotton, linen, calico, etc., will be gratefully received by any member of the committee.

The Liberty Bell will be published at the opening of the Bazaar, and will, we trust, include a wider circle of distinguished writers than ever before. We solicit pecuniary donations from all who have hitherto given in aid of its publication, from all, indeed, who feel as we do, its importance as a most valuable instrumentality

Those of our Committee in Europe will be happy to spend any money that may be sent to them in the purchase of such rare foreign articles as are not to be found in our shops. Any money for this purpose, or for the Liberty Bell, may be sent by mail to A. W. Weston, Weymouth, Mass.

The work before us is so great, the laborers comparatively so few, that the Committee feel it important to present thus early these few practical suggestions, that it may be commenced in good earnest.

RHODE ISLAND ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

ANNUAL MEETING.

The FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING of the Rhode Island Anti-Slavery Society will be held in Mechanics' Hall, in Providence, on Wednesday and Thursday, November 13th and 14th, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M.

Distinguished advocates of Emancipation, from other States, have been invited to be with us, and it is expected that their presence on this occasion will add to the interest of the meetings.

What now we ask is an earnest and faithful response from the people of our own State, who profess abhorrence of the constantly increasing evils of American Slavery—evils that are every day developing themselves, in some new phase, in the moral, social and political communities in which they arise, and for whose existence no man or woman in our State may deny their proper share of responsibility. It is not a time when we may properly shrink from the duty our reason points to, and which our long-cherished faith makes binding upon us. The hounds of the slave gang are upon the track of the fugitive, armed with the weapons of law, and eager for those triumphs which only fiends can shout over—the triumphs of Slavery, and its curses and its chains, over the liberty which makes life a boon worthy of thanksgiving, and which some few of the dark sons of Africa have been so fortunate as to purchase for themselves and their wives and children. If we have hearts, and remember the professions we have made, we shall not fail to come together on this occasion, and utter, in noble and earnest language, our detestation of an unrighteous law, and our determination to remember, in the hour of his trial, the hunted fugitive from the South's dark prison house, as well as those who still clank the heavy and galling chains of American servitude.

In behalf of the Rhode Island Anti-Slavery Society.

JOHN BROWN, President.

Amarancy Paine, Secretary.
Providence, Oct. 8th. 1850.

THE FIFTEENTH

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

To be held in Philadelphia on the 17th, 18th 19th, and 20th of December, 1850.

The Managers of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Fair invite all those who, in previous years, have labored with them, and others interested in the promotion of the cause of Freedom to aid them in the work of preparation for their Fifteenth Annual Fair. The time demands earnest words and deeds. The present is not a season for loitering, or for rest. Our whole nation, from its centre to its remote circumference, is roused from a long and deep lethargy, and the great question of Slavery is about to be decided. In such a crisis the friends of Freedom cannot be too earnest or too busy in their efforts to disseminate their principles. There is no time to be lost. We therefore urge all such to unite heartily and zealously with us in the use of this well-tried and proven instrumentality for the promotion of the Anti-Slavery Cause.

Sarah Pugh,	Sarah T. Child,
Anna M. Hopper,	Anna M. Child,
Emily A. Winslow,	Huldah Justice,
Margaret Forten,	Harriet D. Purvis,
Mary Grew,	Theresa K. Hallowell,
Martha Carman,	Hannah W. Haydock,
Janette Jackson,	Elizabeth Gay,
Rebecca Plumley,	Priscilla Lukens,
Emma Parker,	Hannah L. Stickney,
Maria M. Davis,	Mary P. Stickney,
Sarah A. McKim,	Sarah M. Douglass,
Margaret A. Griscom,	Esther Reckless,
Margaret Jones,	Elizabeth Davis,
Elizabeth Carman,	Clementine G. Ruby,
Mary Shaw,	Gertrude K. Burleigh,
Elizabeth Clendenen,	A. Matilda Cassey,

THE SEVENTEENTH

NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY BAZAAR,

To be held in Boston, commencing on Thursday, the 19th of December, 1850.

It is certainly unnecessary for the undersigned to enlarge upon the importance of this undertaking, the force and solemnity of the motives that have induced them to enter upon and continue it, or the encouraging success that has from year to year crowned the effort.

The patient labor of years has not been in vain. The strongholds of apathy and indifference, ever the most hopeless, have been stormed and carried. The mind of the whole country is aroused to its utmost activity, and He who makes the wrath of man praise Him, by the overruling of it to the carrying forward of His own gracious purposes, enables us to see, in the changing schemes and cowardly combinations of political parties, the hitherto undreamed of treason of eminent Northern statesmen, the increased confusion, violence, not to say madness, of the Southern slave-masters, those elements of human weakness and passion from which, when conflicting on so grand a scale as at present, evolve the great changes which are the way-marks of History.

Hardly could it occur to the most ignorant and thoughtless mind, that the abolition of American Slavery could take place but by an agitation that should convulse the whole nation. The indications that accompany all great changes must be seen here; 'upon the earth, distress of nations with perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth.'

Under these circumstances, the clear-toned utterance of *entire and abstract truth* is needed as never before. Amid the clamor of combinations, compromises propositions and expedients, the trumpet of the Abolitionists should give forth no uncertain sound. As the sole depositories of those truths which alone can save this nation, how deeply should they feel the importance of the position they occupy! It is left to them to declare by words, and by the corresponding actions that alone give words significance that the distinction between right and wrong is eternal and immutable; that justice, duty, heroism, are verities, whose teachings it is neither safe nor wise to question. Hence follows the simple confession of faith that serves as cloud and fire through the most pro-slavery wilderness. Slavery is, under all circumstances, a sin; Immediate Emancipation, in all cases, a duty; and according as the sympathies of every man and woman in this great nation are with the slave or the master, must each individual character be judged—in the eyes of man *now*, at a higher tribunal hereafter

To aid in the promulgation of this testimony are the funds of the Bazaar devoted, and for its help we appeal to all, of every class, creed and condition. We feel entitled to the sympathy, and, as far as ability may extend, to the aid of every human creature, inasmuch as it is for that inalienable human right that underlies all others, *the right of personal ownership*, that we are contending.

On this occasion, any impassioned appeal would be superfluous. The motives to exertion reside in the facts of the case; may they so stir the hearts and arouse the consciences of all whose circumstances enable them to co-operate with us, that the success of this year's Bazaar may be in some measure commensurate with the importance of the decisions now at issue.

ANNE WARREN WESTON.
MARY GRAY CHAPMAN.
FRANCES MARY ROBBINS.
ANN GREENE PHILLIPS.
SARAH S. RUSSELL.
SARAH B. SHAW.
LYDIA D. PARKER.
MARY MAY.
SARAH R. MAY.
MARIA LOWELL.
EVELINA A S SMITH.
HELEN E. GARRISON.
CAROLINE F WILLIAMS.
THANKFUL SOUTHWICK.
SARAH H SOUTHWICK.
ABBY B. FRANCIS.
LOUISA LORING.
MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN.
ELIZA LEE FOLLEN.
SUSAN C. CABOT.
CAROLINE WESTON.
CATHERINE SARGENT.
HENRIETTA SARGENT.
HANNAH TUFTS.
ANN R. BRAMHALL.
MARY WILEY.
ELIZA F. EDDY.
HARRIET M. PALMER.
HARRIET B. HALL.
ELIZABETH GAY.

Poetry.

THE RUNAWAY SLAVE AT PILGRIM'S POINT.

BY ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING.

I.

I STAND on the mark, beside the shore,
Of the first white pilgrims's bended knee;
Where exile changed to ancestor,
And God was thanked for liberty.
I have run through the night—my skin is as dark—
I bend my knee down on this mark—
I look on the sky and the sea.

II.

O, pilgrim-souls, I speak to you:
I see you come out proud and slow
From the land of the spirits, pale as dew,
And round me and round me ye go.
O, pilgrims, I have gasped and ran
All night long from the whips of one
Who, in your names, works sin and woe!

III.

And thus I thought that I would come
And kneel here where ye knelt before,
And feel your souls around me hum
In undertone to the ocean's roar;
And lift my black face, my black hand,
Here in your names, to curse this land
Ye blessed in Freedom's, heretofore.

IV.

I am black, I am black,
And yet God made me, they say:
But if He did so—smiling, back
He must have cast his work away
Under the feet of His white creatures,
With a look of scorn, that the dusky features
Might be trodden again to clay.

V.

And yet He has made dark things
To be glad and merry as light;
There 's a little dark bird sits and sings,
There 's a dark stream ripples out of sight;
And the dark frogs chant in the safe morass,
And the sweetest stars are made to pass
O'er the face of the darkest night.

VI.

But we who are dark, we are dark!
O God, we have no stars!
About our souls, in care and cark,
Our blackness shuts like prison-bars!
And crouch our souls so far behind,
That never a comfort can they find,
By reaching through their prison-bars.

VII.

Howbeit God's sunshine and His frost
They make us hot, they make us cold,
As if we were not black and lost;
And the beasts and birds in wood and wold,
Do fear us and take us for very men;
Could the whippoorwill or the cat of the glen
Look into my eyes and be bold?

VIII.

I am black, I am black,
And once I laughed in girlish glee;
For one of my color stood in the track
Where the drivers drove, and looked at me:
And tender and full was the look he gave!
A Slave looked so at another Slave—
I look at the sky and the sea.

IX.

And from that hour our spirits grew
As free as if unsold, unbought;
We were strong enough, since we were two,
To conquer the world, we thought.
The drivers drove us day by day:
We did not mind; we went one way,
And no better a liberty sought.

X.

In the open ground, between the canes,
He said "I love you," as he passed:
When the shingle-roof rang sharp with the rains,
I heard how he vowed it fast.
While others trembled, he sate in the hut
And carved me a bowl of the cocoa-nut,
Through the roar of the hurricanes.

XI.

I sang his name instead of a song;
Over and over I sang his name:
Backward and forward I sang it along,
With my sweetest notes, it was still the same!
But I sang it low, that the slave-girls near
Might never guess, from what they could hear,
That all the song was a name.

XII.

I look on the sky and the sea!
We were two to love, and two to pray—
Yes, two, O God, who cried on Thee,
Though nothing didst thou say.
Coldly thou sat'st behind the sun,
And now I cry, who am but one—
Thou wilt not speak to-day!

XIII.

We were black, we were black,
We had no claim to love and bliss—
What marvel, ours was cast to wrack?
They wrung my cold hands out of his—
They dragged him—why, I crawled to touch
His blood's-mark in the dust—not much,
Ye pilgrim-souls—though plain as THIS!

XIV.

Wrong, followed by a greater wrong!
Grief seemed too good for such as I;
So the white men brought the shame ere long
To stifle the sob in my throat thereby.
They would not leave me for my dull
Wet eyes!—it was too merciful
To let me weep pure tears, and die.

XV.

I am black, I am black!
I wore a child upon my breast—
An amulet that hung too slack,
And, in my unrest, could not rest!
Thus we went moaning, child and mother,
One to another, one to another,
Until all ended for the best.

XVI.

For hark! I will tell you low—low—
I am black, you see;
And the babe, that lay on my bosom so,
Was far too white—too white for me.
As white as the ladies who scorned to pray
Beside me at church but yesterday,
Though my tears had washed a place for my knee.

XVII.

And my own child—I could not bear
To look in his face, it was so white:
So I covered him up with a kerchief rare,
I covered his face in, close and tight!
And he moaned and struggled as well as might be,
For the white child wanted his liberty—
Ha, ha! he wanted his master's right.

XVIII.

He moaned and beat with his head and feet—
His little feet that never grew!
He stuck them out as it was meet
Against my heart to break it through.
I might have sung like a mother mild,
But I dared not sing to the white-faced child
The only song I knew.

XIX.

And yet I pulled the kerchief close:
He could not see the sun, I swear,
More then, alive, than now he does
From between the roots of the mangles—where?
I know where!—close!—a child and mother
Do wrong to look at one another,
When one is black and one is fair.

XX.

Even in that single glance I had
Of my child's face—I tell you all—
I saw a look that made me mad—
The master's-look that used to fall
On my soul like his lash—or worse—
Therefore, to save it from my curse,
I twisted it round in my shawl.

XXI.

And he moaned and trembled from foot to head—
He shivered from head to foot—
Till, after a time, he lay, instead,
Too suddenly still and mute;
And I felt, beside, a creeping cold—
I dared to lift up just a fold,
As in lifting a leaf of the mango fruit.

XXII.

But MY fruit! ha, ha!—there had been
(I laugh to think on't at this hour!)
Your fine white angels—who have seen
God's secret nearest to His power—
And gathered my fruit to make them wine,
And sucked the soul of that child of mine,
As the humming-bird sucks the soul of the flower.

XXIII.

Ha, ha! for the trick of the angels white!
They freed the white child's spirit so;
I said not a word, but day and night
I carried the body to and fro;
And it lay on my heart like a stone—as chill;
The sun may shine out much as he will—
I am cold, though it happened a month ago.

XXIV.

From the white man's house and the black man's hut
I carried the little body on;
The forest's arms did around us shut,
And silence through the trees did run!
They asked no questions as I went—
They stood too high for astonishment—
They could see God rise on his throne.

XXV.

My little body, kerchiefed fast,
I bore it on through the forest—on—
And when I felt it was tired at last,
I scooped a hole beneath the moon.
Through the forest-tops the angels far,
With a white fine finger in every star
Did point and mock at what was done.

XXVI.

Yet when it all was done aright,
Earth twixt me and my baby strewed—
All changed to black earth—nothing white—
A dark child in the dark—ensued
Some comfort, and my heart grew young;
I sate down smiling there, and sung
The song I told you of, for good.

XXVII.

And thus we two were reconciled,
The white child and black mother, thus;
For, as I sang it—soft and wild,
The same song, more melodious,
Rose from the grave whereon I sate!
It was the dead child singing that,
To join the souls of both of us.

XXVIII.

I look on the sea and the sky!
Where the Pilgrims' ships first anchored lay,
The great sun rideth gloriously!
But the Pilgrims' ghosts have slid away
Through the first faint streaks of the morn!
My face is black, but it glares with a scorn
Which they dare not meet by day.

XXIX.

Ah, in their stead their hunter-sons!
Ah, ah! they are on me! they form in a ring!
Keep off—I brave you all at once—
I throw off your eyes like a noisome thing!
You have killed the black eagle at nest, I think;
Did you never stand still in your triumph, and shrink
From the stroke of her wounded wing?

XXX.

(Man, drop that stone you dared to lift!—)
I wish you, who stand there, seven abreast,
Each for his own wife's grace and gift,
A little corpse as safely at rest,
Hid in the mangles! yes, but *she*
May keep live babies on her knee,
And sing the song she liketh best.

XXXI.

I am not mad—I am black!
I see you staring in my face—
I know you staring, shrinking back—
Ye are born of the Washington race!
And this land is the Free America—
And this mark on my wrist—(I prove what I say)
Ropes tied me up here to the flogging-place.

XXXII.

You think I shrieked there? not a sound!
I hung as a gourd hangs in the sun;
I only cursed them all around
As softly as I might have done
My own child after. From these sands
Up to the mountains, lift your hands,
O Slaves, and end what I begun.

XXXIII.

Whips, curses! these must answer those!
For in this UNION, ye have set
Two kinds of men in adverse rows,
Each loathing each! and all forget
The seven wounds in Christ's body fair;
While He sees gaping everywhere
Our countless wounds that pay no debt.

XXXIV.

Our wounds are different—your white men
Are, after all, not gods indeed,
Nor able to make Christs again
Do good with bleeding. *We* who bleed—
(Stand off!)—we help not in our loss—
We are too heavy for our cross,
And fall and crush you and your seed.

XXXV.

I fall—I swoon—I look at the sky!
The clouds are breaking on my brain:
I am floated along, as if I should die
Of Liberty's exquisite pain!
In the name of the white child waiting for me
In the deep black death where our kisses agree—
White men, I leave you all curse-free,
In my broken heart's disdain!

ENGLAND. —*Liberty Bell.*

AN ANGEL IN THE HOUSE.

BY LEIGH HUNT.

How sweet it were, if without feeble fright,
Or dying of the dreadful beautious sight,
An angel came to us and we could bear
To see him issue from the silent air
At evening in our room, and bend on ours
His divine eyes, and bring us from his bowers
News of dear friends, and children who have never
Been dead indeed—as we shall know for ever.
Alas! We think not what we daily see
About our hearts—angels that are to be,
Or may be if they will, and we prepare
Their souls and ours to meet in happy air—
A child, a friend, a wife whose soft heart sings
In unison with ours, breeding its future wings.

Miscellany.

EBENEZER ELLIOTT.

We copy from the *London Inquirer* this sketch of the life of the Corn-Law Rhymer, and review of his literary works.

Many readers will be disappointed to find that a man of so much experience as Ebenezer Elliott has left behind him only a short Autobiography concerning the first twenty-five years of his life, and filling about as many pages of the work before us. Although urged by many friends to write a history of his life, he declined to do so, urging, first, that the events which he could record were not sufficiently remarkable; and next that the retrospection of many years of struggle and misfortune would involve details too painful for his mind voluntarily to dwell upon. In his own forcible style, Elliott declared, "I am not yet prepared, not yet sufficiently petrified in heart and brain by time and trouble, to tell a tale, in telling which I must necessarily live over again months and years of living death." The task, however, which he shrunk from himself, he at length bequeathed to another; he had thought of engaging his son Francis as his biographer, but altered his intention in the belief that a *son-in-law* might be more impartial. We regret the determination: his own son might, with the assistance of early friends, have given us a history of this patriot's mind struggling onward through seasons of difficulty, and finding through his own awakened taste and love of the beautiful in nature and the good in man, and his trust in God, solace and assuagement even in his darkest days. He might have given us also—what we miss here—the *biography of his poems*, indicating the progress of his taste and the influence of events, and told us more of the influence which he exercised over the minds of others. Mr. Watkins only became acquainted with Elliott eleven years before his death; he resided at a great distance from him; and he has infused into the work far too much of literary criticism.

The book is dedicated to Sir Robert Peel, a facsimile of the letter being prefixed in which he granted Mr. Watkins the desired permission. Elliott had said some very rough things about Sir Robert—even this volume is not free from such aspersions—but since the hon. Baronet had become a free-trader, he might have smiled at sallies directed against the old garments which he had cast aside.

Ebenezer Elliott was born at Rotherham, in the year 1781, at the "New Foundry," where his father had a salary of sixty or seventy pounds a-year, with house, candle, and coal. There the father, a man of great "satiric and humorous powers, and of uncommon political sagacity, used to preach every fourth Sunday to persons who came from distances of twelve and fourteen miles to hear his tremendous doctrines of ultra-Calvinism (he called himself a Berean), and hell hung round with span-long children!" On other days, pointing to the aque tint pictures on the walls, he delighted to dwell on the virtues of slandered Cromwell and of Washington the rebel; or, shaking his sides with laughter, explained the glories of "the glorious victory of his Majesty's forces over the rebels at Bunker's Hill!" "Here," says Elliott, "the reader has a key which will unlock all my future politics. If ever there was a man who knew not fear, that man was the father of the Corn-law Rhymer."

But this stern man had a feeble helpmate: from his mother's infirmities, Elliott thought that he had "derived nervous irritability, bashful awkwardness, a miserable proneness to anticipate evil." In his sixth year he became frightfully disfigured by the small-pox. So far, there was nothing promising in Ebenezer's childhood,—but even at eight years old he had some taste for the beautiful, and loved to see the sun and clouds reflected in a pan of water, though he had also a taste for *the horrible*,—that taste which developed itself in some of his earlier poetry. When a child he excelled in handicraft, but he tells us that his imitative talents won him no respect,—he was not a favorite at home.—"Having got into the rule-of-three, without having first learnt the preliminary rules," Elliott was thought stupid at school, and, consequently, disliked to attend it. His father set him to work in the foundry as a punishment:—

"But," he says, "working in the foundry, so far from being a punishment to me, relieved me from the sense of inferiority which had so long depressed me, for I was not found to be less clever there than other beginners. The result of his experiment vexed the experimenter, and he had good cause for vexation; for it soon appeared that I could play my part at the York-Keelman with the best of its customers. Yet I never thoroughly relished the rude company and coarse enjoyments of the alehouse. My thoughts constantly wandered to the canal-banks and my little ships; and I always built my fortresses, aye, and my castles in the air, too, where the flowers were the finest."

Flowers were to Elliott good angels. His awakening mind, which would inevitably have become rapidly debased had he continued his evil habits, was,—

"Healed and harmonis'd
By the benignant touch of love and beauty."

He was on his way to the Mesborough Chapel, one Sunday, when he called on his Aunt Robinson, a widow who, with only £30 a year, gave her two sons a good education:—

"I thought," he says, "she received me coldly. She did not, I think, know that I had been tipsy a night or two before, but I was conscience-stricken. After a minute's silence, she rose, and laid before me a number of Sowerby's 'English Botany,' which her son Benjamin was purchasing monthly. Never shall I forget the impression made on me by the beautiful plates. I actually touched the figure of the primrose, half convinced that the mealiness on the leaves was real. I felt hurt when she removed the book from me—but she removed it only to show me how to draw the figures, by holding them to the light, with a thin piece of paper before them. On finding that I could so draw them correctly, I was lifted at once above the inmates of the alehouse at least a foot in mental stature. Thenceforward, when I happened to have a spare hour, I went to my aunt's to draw."

A book of dried plants was "the next revealed marvel." Ebenezer now delighted to wander in search of flowers, and had soon a "*Hortus Siccus*" of his own. He became quite familiar "with a beautiful green snake, about a yard long," which seemed to expect him at the top of a lane on the fine Sabbath mornings. "I knew not how often this beautiful and harmless child of God may have sate for his picture in my writings—a dozen, at least." About this time, Ebenezer heard his brother Giles, a clever, handsome youth, who was "a capital reader," read the first book of Thomson's "Seasons."

"When he came to the description of the Polyanthus and Auricula, I waited impatiently till he laid down the book; I then took it into the garden, where I compared the description with the living flowers. Here was another new idea—botany in verse!—a prophecy that the days of scribbling were at hand. But my earliest taste in poetry was like that of Bottom the weaver, who of all things liked best 'a scene to tear a cat in.'"

In after-life, Elliott dated the commencement of his poetic taste to "Sowerby's Botany," and said that, without that impulse, he might have been a drunkard. Yet he did not pursue what is called "the science of Botany," the classifications were too much like letters for his free spirit to delight in.

And now he sought to mend his own imperfect education, he strove with much pains to master English grammer, he read good books, most fortunately bequeathed to his father by a poor curate. Among these were "Barrow's Sermons" (of which he was never weary), "Young's Night Thoughts," some travels, views of countries, and fine colored plates of foreign birds. "Then followed Milton, who held him captive long."

The first of Elliott's poems is entitled "The Vernal Walk;" it was written in his seventeenth year, inscribed to Miss Sarah Austin as "a Man in Counsel," and was first printed at Cambridge, by Benjamin Flower, whom Elliot terms "the father of the liberal newspaper press—a man great in his goodness." While thus laboriously forming his mind from the highest models, Elliott, from his sixteenth to his twenty-third year, worked for his father as laboriously as any servant he had, and without wages, except an occasional shilling or two for pocket-money, weighing, every morning, all the unfinished castings as they were made, &c.

Although Elliott's early poems did not receive much approbation even from the critics in his domestic circle, his attempts were very various. He tried dramatic poetry, but failed, like many other able writers, in that difficult walk. Looking back upon his own works, he denied to himself the praise of genius. "Time," he says, "has developed me not genius, but powers, which exist in all men, and lie dormant in most."

Not so, thought Laureate Southey, a candid and kindly critic, when not warped by political animosity, who reviewed Elliott's works after the appearance of the famous "Corn-law Rhymes" had made him obnoxious to a large party in the country, and who, while he severely deprecated his political views, yet hailed him as a poetic spirit. "When he writes his best," said Southey, "indeed there are none who could write better; and when he is possessed by Radicalism, God forbid that there should be many, who, in such a spirit, should write so well!" He accounted for the scanty sale of the earlier poems by the fact of their being written while Elliott was acquiring the art of poetry.—"They are the work of a learner, of an aspirant. They contain abundant proofs of genius, but the best of them are composed of heterogeneous materials." They were also "carried to a market overstocked with poetry." This critique, which Southey had prepared for the "Quarterly Review," and of which he had even corrected a proof for the press, was rejected by the editor of that periodical, to whose despotic fiat the Laureate invariably bowed with unbecoming submission; it is included in the second volume of "More Verse and Prose, by the Corn-law Rhymer,"—Elliott's last publication.

When Elliott had attained middle age, "his father's affairs, which involved his own, went wrong." At the age of forty, he had to begin the world anew. He left Rotheham, and began business at Sheffield, with a borrowed capital of £100. He dealt in the raw material of Sheffield cutlery, and by prudence and industry he succeeded so far as to retire from business in 1840, with about £6,000, after having first enabled his six sons to "quit the nest." Soon after settling at Sheffield, Elliott became aware of the necessity of the repeal of the Corn-laws. The subject took possession of his ardent mind, and he gave utterance to his thoughts with all the fervor of language he could command. In the preface to his last work, Elliott says—"I claim to have been a pioneer of the greatest, the most beneficial, the only crimeless revolution, which man has yet seen. . . . When I became Free-trade agitator in 1824, I could not find one respectable shopkeeper who thought the Corn-laws an evil." But the evil was before the eyes of Elliott, sleeping or waking, and with all his soul he strove against it. Read as a specimen, this stanzas from one of the later published "Hymns;"—

"The child that vainly toils to aid
Parents, death-doom'd by fettered trade;
The sire whose hopeless son
Lives but to be undone;
The townsman, paid with less and less:
The homeless thrall of hopelessness;
The peasant, spurn'd, starv'd, hunted, jail'd,
Because his law-made doom prevail'd;
Still shall they feed with pangs the Moloch of the land,
That Rapine o'er crushed hearts may drive his four-in-hand!"

Such were the strains which Elliott put forth under the name of "Corn-law Rhymes," or "Hymns." His rough and indignant eloquence sometimes outraged propriety; it was with truth that, as he said with true feeling,—

"Distempered if not mad,
I feed on Nature's bone, and mess with scorn.
I would not, could not if I would, be glad;
But, like shade-loving plants, am happiest sad."

But we cannot agree, by any means, with his biographer in crying "pity that he could not have always breathed the mountain breeze—yea, have been the Zephyr itself." No, indeed; to blow off the restraints of monopoly was no Zephyr's task—it was a rough and hard, but an honorable task, and well did Sheffield's bard perform his part in it, and rightly does he deserve a fitting monument in that town where he so long and earnestly labored, and of which he wrote thus:—

"Ere Bedford's loaf or Erin's sty be thine,
Cloud-rolling Sheffield! want shall humble all.
Town of the unbowed poor! thou shalt not pine
Like the fall'n rustic, licensed Rapine's thrall;
But first to rise, will be the first to fall!
Slow are thy sons the pauper's trade to learn."
Village Patriarch.

We must also give our readers what Elliott declared to be "not an overcharged picture of the condition of some of the mechanics of Sheffield. The home of taste," says Elliott, "is within the reach of thousands of them:"—

THE HOME OF TASTE.

"You seek the home of taste, and find
The proud mechanic there,
Rich as a king, and less a slave,
Thron'd in his elbow chair!
Or on his sofa, reading Locke,
Beside his open door!
Why start?—why envy worth like his,
The carpet on his floor?

"You seek the home of sluttery—
'Is John at home?' you say,
'No, sir; he's at the "Sportsman's Arm,"
'The dog fight's o'er the way.'
O lift the workman's heart and mind
Above low sensual sin!
Give him a home! the home of taste!
Outbid the house of gin!

"O give him taste! it is the link
Which binds us to the skies—
A bridge of rainbows, thrown across
The gulf of tears and sighs;
Or like a widower's little one—
An angel in a child—
That leads him to her mother's chair,
And shows him how she smiled."
Elliott's "Miscellaneous Poems."

We would rather quote from Elliott than from his biographer, but Mr. Watkins has written one sentence which demands contradiction. He says—

"The attentive reader of this Autobiography will perceive that Ebenezer Elliott was born with the fatal gifts of Genius—a thing as much to be deplored in the present social system as the brand on the forehead of Cain."

The "attentive reader" who will go through all Mr. Watkin's part of this work will find that he himself makes a counter-statement at p. 193. The general strain of Elliott's life and writings tended to prove how spiritualising and refining the character improves the happiness of man. In a lecture which he delivered at the Sheffield Mechanics' Institution, "On Cowper and Burns," Elliott said—

"Perhaps no falsehood has been oftener repeated, than that men of genius are less fortunate and less virtuous than other men: but the obvious truth, that they who attempt little are less liable to failure than they who attempt much, will account for the proverbial good luck of fools. In our estimate of the sorrows and failings of litterary men, we forget that sorrow is the common lot; we forget, too, that the misfortunes and the errors of men of genius are recorded, and that their minutest faults will be sure to find zealous historians."

In another lecture, delivered at the same Institution, Elliott thus feelingly expressed himself:—

"Who would not be one of the Legion of Immortals, though frail as the flower of the field, yet eternal in their usefulness? Shakspeare or Milton of this year or the next! What though it may be true that universal reputations are no longer possible? And what though it may be true that the soldiers of the Legion of Good Works will be so numerous as to tread down each other? Their consequences cannot be trodden down. Your writings may perish with, or before you, but not their results, if indeed ye are Shakespeares and Miltons."

"Look abroad on life—use it and serve it," was one of Elliott's characteristic admonitions to a young literary friend.

Mr. Watkins describes the house at Upperthorpe, near Sheffield, where Elliott resided while engaged in business:—

"A neat stone building standing on an eminence in the midst of a large garden. On the mantle-piece of his breakfast-parlor stood a small full-length figure of Scott, and an extract from Channing, "On the Reasonableness of Christianity," written in his own bold hand and framed. A few books lay on a table with Sowerby's Botany, which, he said, first made him a poet."

On leaving business, Elliott withdrew into the country, and built himself a house at great Houghton, near Barnsley; where he appears to have been rather too much out of society, too much among squires and game-keepers for complete satisfaction; but he was declining in health, and saddened by disease supposed to be incurable. He enjoyed his walks, however, until the last month of his life, and his mental vigor remained uninjured nearly to the last. At his wish, the marriage of his daughter was hastened, that it might take place before his death. On the 17th of November, 1849, Elliott caused himself to be lifted out of bed, and placed at the window to see the family group depart for the church where the ceremony was performed, and requested them to come to him for his blessing on their return. When they gathered round his bedside, he said, "This is Roger's Human Life!" He planned several excursions for the married pair with kind solicitude, and, though dying, all his thoughts were for the living.

During this last fortnight of life, "the trees were weeping their leaves for the poet of Nature, and his favorite little bird, the Robin, perched beneath his window, and trilled its pensive lay. He heard it, and dictated the very last verses which he wrote:

'Thy notes, sweet Robin, soft as dew,
Heard soon or late, are dear to me;
To music I would bid adieu,
But not to thee.

'When from my eyes earth's lifeful throng
Has passed away, no more to be,
Then, Autumn's primrose, Robin's song,
Return to me.'

This song was sung to him by his daughter, like the music of the dying swan." He died on the first of December, and was buried, by his own direction, where his daughter was married.

In politics, Elliott was a decided reformer, but not a socialist; he held that "competition is the law of God, unerring as that which carries the earth round the sun." The right to vote for members of parliament he thought should be "founded on property and knowledge," that property and knowledge which every self-sustained person possesses. "No boy is born possessed of a right to cut his own fingers, and before any person meddles with mine, I would have him understand the edge-tools."

A SCHOOL EXERCISE
OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

In a recent article, we collected for the entertainment of our young friends, out of Guizot's lectures, some of the holy legends which formed the delight and solace of the refined and educated in the fifth and sixth centuries. From the same author we will now give them a specimen of the school instruction, dispensed in the palace of Charlemagne, between the years 782 and 796, to a select class consisting of the young courtiers and relatives of that monarch, who was usually himself present at the exercises. This school, called the School of the Palace, was superintended by a learned philosopher, named Alcuin, who was born at the city of York, in England, about the year 735, and being sent on a mission to Rome in 780, he met Charlemagne in Parma. The emperor at once pressed him to take up his abode in France, to which he consented, and presiding over the School of the Palace, he and his pupils always accompanied the emperor in his journeys. M. Guizot supposes that the instruction was conveyed principally in conversation, and among others Alcuin had for his auditors, Charles, Pepin, and Louis, the sons of Charlemagne, Gisla his daughter, and his sister of the same name. Anglibert and Adalhard his privy-counsellors, with Gunrade the sister of Adalhard, and Richtrude a nun. A curious specimen of one of these school exercises have come down to the present day, which though puerile when considered as a means of education, deserves attention as an evidence of the eager curiosity with which the mind, in its crude infancy, ranges over the greatest variety of subjects, and delights to take in odd combinations and ingenious ideas. It is a conversation between Alcuin and Pepin, Charlemagne's second son, at that period a youth of fifteen or sixteen; parts of it here follow:—

Pepin. What is writing?
Alcuin. The keeper of history.
P. What is speaking?
A. The interpreter of the soul.
P. What is it gives birth to speaking?
A. The tongue.
P. What is the tongue?
A. The whip of air.
P. What is life?
A. Happiness for the happy; misery for the miserable; the expectation of death.
P. What is death?
A. An inevitable event; a doubtful journey; a subject of tears for the living; a confirmation of wills; a robber of the living.
P. What is man?
A. The slave of death, a passing traveller, a guest in his own abode.
P. How is man placed?
A. As a traveller exposed to the world.
P. Where is he placed?
A. Between six walls.
P. What are they?
A. That above, that below, that on the right, that on the left, that in front, that behind.
P. What is the body?
A. The abode of the soul.
P. What is light?
A. The torch of all things.
P. What is the sun?
A. The splendor of the universe, the beauty of the firmament, the grace of nature, the glory of the day, the distributor of the hours.
P. What is the earth?
A. The mother of all that grows, the nurse of all that exists, the granary of life, the gulf which swallows up all things.
P. What is winter?
A. The exile of spring.
P. What is spring?
A. The painter of the earth.
P. What is summer?
A. The power which clothes the earth, and ripens fruits.
P. What is autumn?
A. The granary of the year.
P. What is the year?
A. The chariot of the world.
P. What is a ship?
A. A ship is a wandering house, an inn ready in all places, a traveller who leaves no trace behind him.
P. What is it renders bitter things sweet.
A. Hunger.
P. What is it of which men never grow weary?
A. Gain.
P. What is marvellous?
A. I saw the other day a man standing, a dead man walking, a man walking who had never breathed.
P. How may that have been? Explain yourself.
A. It was an image reflected in the water.
P. How could I have failed to understand you? I who have so often seen the same thing.
A. As you are a youth of good disposition, and endowed with natural capacity, I will put to you several other unusual questions; endeavor to solve them.
P. I will do my best, if I make mistakes, you must correct them.
A. Doubtless. Some one who is unknown to me has conversed with me, having no tongue, and no voice; he was not before, and will not be hereafter, and I neither heard or knew him. What means this?
P. Perhaps you mean a dream, master.
A. Exactly so, my son. Listen once more: I have seen the dead engender the living, and the dead consumed by the breath of the living.
P. Fire was produced by rubbing together dead branches, and it then consumed the branches.
A. You are quite accurate. L. O.

[*The Child's Friend.*

THE GENUINE PRIZE SONG FOR JENNY LIND.

(*At the service of Mr Barnum.*)

I AM glad I have come from my own northern home,
Far away o'er the wide rolling sea,
For I feel that I stand on the glorious land,
Where alone dwells a people that's free!
Never here for vile gold human beings are sold,
Who the tint of our brotherhood wear;
If that token they lack—if the creatures are black—
Oh, why then that's another affair!
La, la, la!
Yes—of coruse that's another affair!

Every man of each sect holds his head up, erect
As the eagle that faces the sun;
Ah! you do not see here class o'er class domineer,
Here oppressed or oppressors are none.
In this nation sublime, wretches branded with crime
Rue alone in base thraldom their sin;
And the guilt of all dies in American eyes
Far the deepest, is darkness of skin!
La, la, la!
Yes—the worst guilt is darkness of skin!

Here a fond wedded pair independently share
All the joys of the conjugal life,
There is no law to part heart united to heart,
Wife from husband, and husband from wife.
Such barbarity fell, as the offspring to sell
From the parent is wholly unknown;
But their lips if too full, and their hair curly wool,
Should have no child nor wife of their own!
La, la, la!
No, they have no child nor wife of their own!

At the tyrant's proud hand there's no scourge to command
On this side the Atlantic's broad wave,
No American can by his own fellow-man
Be disgraced by the stripes of the slave.
Man is sacred from blows—by the right of his nose,
If it be not too broad and too flat:
Then you're licensed to thrash—then fall on with the lash—
He's only a nigger, and born to the cat!
La, la, la!
Yes, a nigger, and born to the cat!—[*Punch.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

—"ON Sunday," says *Galignani*, "an ascension, which exceeded in boldness anything that has hitherto been attempted, took place from the Hippodrome. The *Uranus*, the balloon belonging to M. Poitevin, rose in the air, carrying, in addition to the aeronaut, three young females belonging to that establishment, who were suspended from the car. They had wings affixed to their shoulders, and appeared as if flying in the air; their ascent was hailed with shouts from the immense concourse of persons assembled, but a feeling of terror seemed to predominate at seeing the females suspended in mid air, without anything apparent to support them. After being about an hour in the air, they alighted in safety on a plain near Villejuif."

—A CORRESPONDENT of the *Birmingham Mercury* concludes that, should Kossuth visit England, he would be sure to stay, for a time, in London, and, in such a case, he thinks, "it would be worthy the attention of those who are in the habit of getting up railway trips to try and manage simultaneous trips to the metropolis, from all parts of the kingdom, for the purpose of seeing the 'foremost man of the time.' Supposing this to be the case, if Kossuth could be induced to address a few words to an English audience, *standing* on the spot where that most abhorred of mortals, Haynau, *fell* beneath the besoms of Southwark, what an historic event!—what an audience that would be!"

—AMERICA AND HER SLAVES.—The last accounts from America show too plainly that the new Fugitive Slaves' Bill, which we spoke of in a recent number, has rapidly been put into full and cruel operation. Even in New York, which boasts of being the model city of American enlightenment and civilization, men who have been residing there for years, as peaceful and industrious members of society, are torn from their families, and hurried off to the South in chains, under the powers which this odious Bill gives to the slave-master.

Fortunately for humanity, Canada still is English, and the oppressed negro, who once can cross the Canadian frontier, will find, under the English flag, that protection from tyranny which the vaunted banner of the Stars and Stripes now can nowhere afford him.—*London Weekly Times.*

—A BALLOON VISIT.—In a letter, dated Madrid, and inserted in *La Presse*, we are told that a colossal balloon, or rather aerial steam-ship, constructed by a M. J. Montemayer, was to "sail" from Madrid to London, on the 16th instant. It is enabled (says the letter,) to sail *against* contrary winds, by the aid of enormous wings, beating the air alternately, and fashioned almost like the wings of a bird. On the forepart of the balloon, corresponding to the prow of a ship, is fixed a gigantic funnel, made to absorb, by means of internal machinery, a considerable quantity of air, which, being let off by a second funnel placed at the stern of the balloon, propels it with extraordinary power. This vast mass is calculated to attain a speed of 150 miles an hour in calm weather. Its appearance is that of a powerful steam frigate under sail and steam! We have not yet heard of its *arrival*. The *Boulogne Gazette* anticipated its descent there for a supply of gas! The *Gazette* had also heard that a party in Paris, indignant at the idea of the Spaniards claiming the invention of steering balloons, had also mounted into the upper regions, determined to be in London before them.

—DR. BOWRING.—Dr. Bowring's numerous friends in Europe will be glad to learn that the health of that gentleman, during the last month has considerably improved. We have no mere desire to flatter the learned doctor when saying, that we think Lord Palmerston was well advised in choosing him as Mr. Macgregor's successor. There is a secret about the judicious selection of consular officers for China. Mr. M'Culloch has a quotation that "a British consul, in order to be properly qualified for his employment, should take care to make himself master of the language used by the court and magistracy where he resides, so as to converse with ease upon subjects relating to his duties." Now, it is next to an impossibility to master the Chinese language under a ten years' residence, and the time taking up in the study of it detracts from other equally important avocations; whilst it is an astonishing fact, that the close attention absolutely necessary, when the study is once begun, entirely untunes the mind for business of every day life. Dr. Bowring, with a facility peculiarly his own, has however, in the short period of his stay here, so far mastered the colloquial, as to be enabled to keep up a running conversation with Chinese officers, and enjoys, with this acquisition, advantages which the other consuls in China do not, we believe, possess. But the great qualification for a consular officer in China is a certain inquisitiveness, inducing him not to stop for things to come to him, or be brought round in natural order, but to anticipate—to go, in short, and seek for them. Without knowing the contents of Dr Bowring's library, we will make bold to say that it contains such an amount of useful and novel remark as can only be conceived by those who have some China knowledge of his activity and genius.—*Overland Friend of China.*

—THE REMAINS OF JAMES THE SECOND.—The following curious account was given to me by Mr. Fitzsimons, an Irish gentleman, upwards of 80 years of age, with whom I became acquainted when resident with my family at Toulouse, in September, 1840; he having resided in that city for many years as a teacher of the French and English languages, and had attended the late Sir William Follett in the former capacity there in 1817. He said:—"I was a prisoner in Paris, in the convent of the English Benedictines, in the Rue St. Jacques, during part of the revolution. In the year 1793 or 1794, the body of King James II. of England was in one of the chapels there, where it had been deposited some time, under the expectation that it would one day be sent to England for interment in Westminster Abbey. It had never been buried. The body was in a wooden coffin, enclosed in a leaden one, and that again enclosed in a second wooden one, covered with black velvet. While I was so a prisoner the sans-culottes broke open the coffins to get at the lead to cast into bullets. The body lay exposed nearly a whole day. It was swaddled like a mummy, bound tight with garters. The sans-culottes took out the body, which had been embalmed. There was a strong smell of vinegar and camphor. The corpse was beautiful and perfect; the hands and nails were very fine; I moved and bent every finger. I never saw so fine a set of teeth in my life. A young lady, a fellow-prisoner, wished much to have a tooth; I tried to get one out for her, but could not, they were so firmly fixed. The feet also were very beautiful. The face and cheeks were just as if he were alive. I rolled his eyes; the eyeballs were perfectly firm under my finger. The French and English prisoners gave money to the sans-culottes for showing the body. They said he was a good sans-culotte, and they were going to put him into a hole in the public churchyard like other sans-culottes; and he was carried away, but where the body was thrown I never heard. King George IV. tried all in his power to get tidings of the body, but could not. Around the chapel were several wax moulds of the face hung up, made, probably, at the time of the king's death, and the corpse was very like them. The body had been originally kept at the palace of St. Germains, whence it was brought to the convent of the Benedictines. Mr. Porter, the prior, was a prisoner at the time in his own convent."—*Notes and Queries.*

—THE FOUNDER OF THE HOSPITAL FOR ERRING WOMEN.—St. Francis de Sales, of a noble family of Savoy, was born near Annecy, in 1567. His mother, who had reared him with difficulty, and loved him with inexpressible tenderness, had early dedicated him in her heart to God; and it is recorded, that the first words he uttered distinctly were, "Dieu et ma mère n'aiment bien" and to the last moment of his life, love, in its scriptural sense, of a tender, all-embracing charity, was the element in which he existed. He was Bishop of Geneva from 1602 to 1622, and most worthily discharged all the duties of his position. He is celebrated for his devotional writings, which are almost as much admired by Protestants as by Catholics for their eloquence and Christian spirit: he is yet more interesting for his benign and tolerant character; his zeal, so tempered by gentleness. The learned Cardinal du Perron, famous as a controversialist, once said, "If you would have the heretics convinced, bring them to me; if you would have them converted, send them to the Bishop of Geneva." The distinction here drawn, and the feeling expressed, seem to me alike honorable to the speaker. By the *unco-guid* of his own time and faith, St. Francis de Sales was blamed for two things especially. In the first place, he had, in his famous book, the "Introduction to a Devout Life," permitted dancing as a recreation. Even his eulogists think it necessary to explain and excuse this relaxation from strict discipline; and a fanatic friar of his own diocese had the insolence, after preaching against him, to burn his book in the face of the congregation: the mild bishop did not even remonstrate. The second subject of reproach against him was, his too great gentleness to sinners who came to him for comfort and advice. The most lost and depraved of these he would address in words of encouragement: "All I ask of you is, not to despair!" To those who remonstrated against this excess of mercy, he contented himself with replying, "Had Saul been rejected, should we have had St Paul?" This good prelate died suddenly in 1622, and was canonised by Alexander VII. in 1665. Bossuet, Bourdaloue, and Fléchier, enshrined him in their eloquent homage. Portraits and devotional prints and pictures of St. Francis de Sales were formerly very popular in France. In the churches of the convents of the Visitation, and in the churches of the Minimes, they were commonly met with. The Minimes have enrolled him in their own order, in consequence of his extreme veneration for their patriarch, St. Francis de Paula; but if he is to be included in any order, I believe it should be that of the Augustines, as a regular canon or priest. He was so remarkable for the beauty of his person, and the angelic expression of his regular and delicate features, that painting could hardly idealise him. He is represented in the episcopal cope generally bare headed; and in prints the usual attribute is a heart pierced and crowned with thorns, and surmounted by a cross placed within a glory of light.—*Legends of the Monastic Order, by Mrs. Jameson.*